

VOLUME XLVI • NUMBER 2

February 1955

THE
ROMANIC
REVIEW

FOUNDED BY PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF
ROMANCE LANGUAGES IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS • PUBLISHER



THE ROMANIC REVIEW

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION

JUSTIN O'BRIEN, *General Editor*

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

DINO BIGONGLIARI

LEROY C. BREUNIG

ANGEL DEL RÍO

ENRICO DE' NEGRI

NATHAN EDELMAN

OTIS FELLOWS

DONALD M. FRAME

JEAN HYTIER

BERT M-P. LEEFMANS

LAWTON P. G. PECKHAM

MARIO A. PEI

JEANNE VARNEY PLEASANTS

JAMES F. SHEARER

NORMAN L. TORREY

EDWARD WILLIAMSON

DAVID I. GROSSVOGEL, *Managing Editor*

VOLUME XLVI

FEBRUARY 1955

NUMBER 1

ARTICLES

- Diderot's Unedited *Plan d'un opéra comique* J. ROBERT LOY 3

REVIEW ARTICLES

- Flaubert's Correspondence B. F. BART 25
Apollinaire since 1950 LEROY C. BREUNIG 35

REVIEWS

- Grace Frank, *The Medieval French Drama*. [WILLIAM A. NITZE] 41
Ernest Hatch Wilkins, *A History of Italian Literature*. [A. T. MAC-ALLISTER] 44
Helmut A. Hatzfeld, *A Critical Bibliography of the New Stylistics Applied to the Romance Literatures, 1900-1952*. [MICHAEL RIFFATERRE] 49
A. Parménie et C. Bonnier de la Chapelle, *Histoire d'un éditeur et de ses auteurs: P.-J. Hetzel (Stahl)*. [JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ] 52

REVIEWS IN BRIEF

Robert E. Hallowell, *Ronsard and the Conventional Roman Elegy* [GILBERT HIGHET]; Ludovico Ariosto: *Orlando furioso*, trans. by Allan Gilbert [E. W.]; Jean de Sponde: *Méditations*, ed. Alan Boase [VICTOR E. GRAHAM]; Jean Laporte, *La Doctrine de Port-Royal: La Morale* [J.-J. DEMOREST]; Nicolo Secchi: *Self-Interest*, ed. Helen Andrews Kaufman [J. H.]; Americo Castro, *The Structure of Spanish History* [STEPHEN GILMAN]; *Voltaire's Correspondence*, Vols. IV-VI, ed. Theodore Besterman [N. L. T.]; Pierre Salomon, *George Sand* [ALBERT J. GEORGE]; Walter T. Pattison, *Benito Pérez Galdós and the Creative Process* [W. H. SHOEMAKER]; Edmond Jaloux, *Avec Marcel Proust* [PHILIP KOLB]; *Cette âme ardente . . . Choix de lettres de André Suarès à Romain Rolland* [WILLIAM T. STARR]; Margaret Crosland, *Colette: A Provincial in Paris* [ALVIN LABAT]; Italo Svevo, *Opere* [KARL LUDWIG SELIG]; Paul Claudel, *Mémoires improvisés* [FERNAND VIAL]; Konrad F. Bieber, *L'Allemagne vue par les écrivains de la résistance française* [LEON S. ROUDIEZ]; *Cahiers de la Compagnie Madeleine Renaud—Jean-Louis Barrault* [J. V. P.]; Ch. Vossler, *Langue et Culture de la France* [L. P. G. P.]; Marianne Mercier-Campiche, *Le Théâtre de Giraudoux* [LAURENT LESAGE]

THE ROMANIC REVIEW is published four times a year (February-April-October-December) by Columbia University Press, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md. Single copies \$1.25 (foreign \$1.35); \$5.00 a year (foreign, including Canada, \$5.30). Subscribers should notify the publisher of change of address at least three weeks before publication of issue with which change is to take effect. Entered as second-class matter, at the post office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1955 by Columbia University Press.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to Professor Justin O'Brien, Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York City. THE REVIEW will not be responsible for the return of manuscripts unless accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. For all questions regarding preparation of manuscripts and printing style, consult the *MLA Style-Sheet* which originally appeared in *PMLA*, LXVI (1951), 3-31, and is available in reprints.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to Columbia University Press, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md., or 2940 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y.

DIDEROT'S UNEDITED PLAN D'UN OPÉRA COMIQUE

By J. Robert Loy

THE following unedited sketch for a comic opera will not much change our ideas about Diderot. It will, however, tend to confirm current notions about his thoughts on dramatic art and opera, while adding one more example to the all too meagre store of his creative literary documents.

The text has been copied from the manuscript in the Vandeul collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale.¹ A check with Professor Dieckmann's invaluable *Inventaire*² showed that he had classified the *Plan* as unedited. That the manuscript is in Diderot's handwriting, there can be no doubt. There is, however, always the possibility that this is the work of another, copied out by Diderot in a moment of enthusiasm, but the attentive reader will find enough echoes of a familiar style to conclude that we have here one of Diderot's works. Yet Diderot could have collaborated with one or more persons in the writing of it. There would be all the more reason for suspecting such collaboration if one could definitely place the piece in the early 1750's, at the time of the *querelle des bouffons*. Assézat argues convincingly that Diderot was very probably the "secretary" and editor for D'Alembert, D'Holbach, Grimm and himself in the case of the *Arrêt rendu à l'amphithéâtre de l'Opéra*.³ Given the half-serious, half-bohemian cliquishness of the quarrel, it is not completely beyond possibility that the same four, or others, might have amused themselves by writing a libretto for an opera of which they could approve. Nor would it be unusual that Diderot should have had the lion's share in shaping the plan and that it would fall to him to copy it out in final form. Were such collaboration the fact, one is surprised to find no mention of it in the writings of any of the men concerned. It seems certain that the basic plot, the characterizations and most of the final expression are Diderot's.

The first points of reference suggested by the outline are Diderot's ideas about opera as an art form. As far back as the *Bijoux*, there is a passage (chapter XIII) which reveals an enthusiastic attitude toward two of the schools of opera later to figure in the famous quarrel. "Les gens de goût . . .," says Diderot, "faisaient grand cas de tous les deux (Rameau and Lulli)." It is fairly patent that in 1748 Diderot knew at least as much

1. I owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Herbert Dieckmann and the Harvard Library for their kind cooperation in making available micro-film to check my original copy.

2. Herbert Dieckmann, *Inventaire du Fonds Vandeul et inédits de Diderot* (Genève: Droz, 1951), p. 8.

3. See *Œuvres complètes A-T* XII, 141 and 155. J. G. Prod'homme ("Diderot et la musique," in *Zeitschrift. Internationale Musik-Gesellschaft* 15: 156-62, 177-82), doubts that Diderot wrote any of the three pamphlets in volume XII.

about opera and music as the average cultured Parisian. As early as that year, he had shown an admiration and preference for Italian music.⁴ But there is nonetheless something to be said for Adolphe Jullien's statement⁵ that Diderot is still essentially an amateur in his judgment at the beginning of the storm of pamphlets during the quarrel. The notion of what is aesthetically superior has not taken final form in his mind, and the theatre years are yet to come.

It is much later that he gives a considered opinion of *opéra comique* in the *Entretiens avec Dorval* (1757), after the appearance of the sixth volume of the *Encyclopédie*. In the third *Entretien*, Dorval, speaking of the dancers, poets, musicians and producers of the lyric theatre, says that none of them has a true idea of what opera should be. "... Peut-il être bon," he queries, "si l'on ne s'y propose point l'imitation de la nature et de la nature la plus forte?" Dorval continues:

Chacun de ces arts en particulier a pour but l'imitation de la nature; et pour employer leur magie réunie, on fait choix d'une fable! Et l'illusion n'est-elle pas déjà assez éloignée? Et qu'a de commun avec la métamorphose ou le sortilège, l'ordre universel des choses, qui doit toujours servir de base à la raison poétique? Des hommes de génie ont ramené, de nos jours, la philosophie du monde intelligible dans le monde réel. Ne s'en trouvera-t-il point un qui rende le même service à la poésie lyrique, et qui la fasse descendre des régions enchantées sur la terre que nous habitons?

Reiterating the *Adducite mihi psallem* of the prophet Elisha, Dorval/Diderot continues his subject by upholding Italian opera:

Le genre lyrique d'un peuple voisin a des défauts sans doute, mais beaucoup moins qu'on ne pense. Si le chanteur s'assujettissait à n'imiter, à la cadence, que l'accent inarticulé de la passion dans les airs de sentiment, ou que les principaux phénomènes de la nature, dans les airs qui font tableau, et que le poète sût que son ariette doit être la péroraison de sa scène, la réforme serait bien avancée.⁶

Upon comparison of this passage with the flood of comic operas during the 1750's, several observations can be made. The hero and heroine of the majority of comic operas, as of Rousseau's *Devin*, had been the colorless stock characters left over from seventeenth-century pastoral literature: the shepherd and the shepherdess. In Diderot's sketch, Colin and Colette are simple young bourgeois. In a second class of operas (like Favart's

4. "La fée vérité aime la musique, surtout l'italienne." *Oiseau blanc*, *Œuvres complètes A-T*, IV, 408.

5. *La Musique et les philosophes au XVIIIe siècle*. André Billy (*Vie de Diderot*, 120 ff.) quoting Grétry would seem to concur. A. Oliver, however (*The Encyclopedists as Critics of Music*, 155 ff.), would agree with Tournoux that Jullien's judgment was limited and prejudiced. Cf. also L. Crocker, *Two Diderot Studies*, 1952, p.113.

6. *Œuvres complètes A-T* VII, 156-57. A. Oliver (op. cit. supra) uses part of these passages to point to the arrival of Gluck on the musical scene.

Bastien et Bastienne), the pastoral characters had indeed turned into *gens du peuple*, but speaking such bad French or clearly so confused in their naïveté as to solicit either the laughter or the condescending amusement of a more cultured audience. At no time in Diderot's outline does one feel the need to condescend to the characters; they are clearly common people, it is true, but they are readily accepted as such and their problems, although slight, are nonetheless real. A third classification of types of comic opera popular at the St.-Germain and St.-Laurent *foires* was the exotically extravagant opera: *Le Cadi dupé*, *Le Chinois revenu en France*. There is no element of such exoticism in Diderot's outline.

Dorval had struck out at the "fable" which most operas chose for vehicle. He was perhaps thinking of all the accepted high opera such as the *Indes galantes*, *Hippolyte et Aricie*, *Castor et Pollux* (despite the rather "gentle handling" of Rameau by the *Encyclopédistes*) which, in effect are far removed from any world of the "universal order of things." But he was thinking equally of all the recent "new productions since 1752" of which one gets some idea by scanning the titles in the publisher's notice of, for example, the *Nouvelle Bastienne* (published "chez Duchesne, à Paris," 1755): *La Musique de la Fontaine de Jouvence*, *La Coupe enchantée*, *La Magie inutile*, *Le Miroir magique*. One has only to read in succession some of these productions of Favart, Vadé and others with their *chœur des Scythes*, *chœur des Nymphes*, their *Cydalise* and *Mirto*, and their stock of *Colins* and *Colettes* to agree with Dorval that we are here far from reality. There is no mythology in Diderot's outline and no magic save for the ruse of the *bateleurs* which fools only the ridiculous Richard. The *Sabbat*, probably meant to be taken seriously by some of the simple merchants in the opera, is treated in a burlesque fashion. There is the atmosphere of the St.-Germain fair (clearly indicated by Diderot in the stage directions) and several scenes suggesting the tempo and diapason of life in a community of merchants. The scenes in Blaise's tavern are especially successful in conjuring up a typical local drinking place. Diderot's knowing way with dialogue has certainly not left him here; his characters speak the language of St.-Germain merchants and do not, like the *peuple* in other comic operas reëcho the artificial idiom of literature. Thus, without further insistence on what is *real*, the present sketch seems to follow Dorval's recommendations for bringing lyric opera back to the real world from the world of stale fable.

For other suggestions made by Dorval in the *Entretiens*, less can be said. The upshot of the conversations is that there needs to be a serious tragic and comic lyric theatre (this along with the *drame bourgeois* and other considerations). As outlined, this opera is certainly not tragic; it could only be judged in Diderot's own terms, then, as serious, comic opera, for Dorval and his creator have made no case for a lighter medium (vaudeville, burlesque, or farce with music) when speaking of the lyric stage.

What the Encyclopedist was actually sketching here, was his notion of the *opera buffa*, not discussed in detail in his theorizing with Dorval—and for good reason. For his suspicions as to the place *opera buffa* would take in the development of *opéra comique* were to be justified by the legitimization of the genre with Mozart and nineteenth-century Italian opera.

There are, of course, the well-known passages of the *Neveu de Rameau* to be considered. In the case of this sketch they seem less helpful than the Dorval passages. In general, the conclusions of Rameau-Lui on comic opera and on opera in general seem to insist on the marriage of poetry and music, and center about the merits of the French language and French librettists in writing for opera. "L'accent est la pépinière de la mélodie," says Rameau as he describes the spoken word as one line, the music as another line which must be integrated. If only the music of our outline were available, one could judge of Diderot's success at such an integration.⁷ In any case, he foresees the kind of musical rhythm he wants for a scene by suggesting that rhythm in words. In general, this rhythm is simple and clipped. Diderot seems aware of the fact that clear diction is, or ought to be, an important ingredient of opera.

Although the theoretical works on the opera come late in the 1750's, the present sketch strikes one as having been written at a time when Diderot was much influenced by the recently-born and prevailing *opéra comique* (in essence *opera buffa*) which still betrays its origins in the *théâtre de foire* and the *opéra de foire* and which, in the early fifties, was strongly influenced by the Italian notion of opera of the type of Pergolesi, Rinaldo di Capua and Latilla. To put it another way, the present sketch might be a concrete example of a desirable lyric medium for which the general theorizing will come later. At the close of the opera, Diderot is clearly suggesting that he wants for his own grieving Richard a scene analogous to that of Tracollo's despair. He has in mind the air of "*Povero, povero . . . gargarozzo!*" as he writes the simple stage direction for Act 5, Scene 4: "*Richard seul. Son désespoir. Pauvère Tracollo. Già l'anima s'en va.*" Diderot could have known the Pergolesi opera *Livietta e Tracollo* before it was given in Paris (première at Naples⁸ on 25 October 1734), but more likely he could have known it well only after its Parisian première (as *Tracollo medico ignorante*) on the first of May 1753. Moreover, that year with the appearance of the pamphlets and of Rousseau's *Devin*⁹ would seem to be

7. That Diderot had composed music of his own we know from *Œuvres complètes A-T I*, xxii, and from the testimony of the English musicologist Burney in *Dr. Charles Burney's Continental Travels, 1770-72* (London: Blackie and Son, 1927), pp. 80-82.

8. Fabre gives Rome in *Le Neveu de Rameau* (Genève: Droz, 1950), p. 220.

9. Rousseau, in his *Confessions*, places the beginning of his "longue chaîne de misères" in Book VIII, at the time of the *Devin* and the *Lettre sur la musique française* and their aftermath. He thinks that his so-called friends might have pardoned his writing excellent books but that they could not forgive him for having written an opera, for none of them was in a position to attempt the same career or to aspire to the same honors. At least two of those friends, Diderot and D'Holbach attempted to do so.

the earliest period at which Diderot would be sufficiently absorbed in opera (busy as he was with the launching of the *Encyclopédie*) to sketch out one of his own. It seems reasonably safe to assume that the following text is not anterior to 1 May 1753. Proof of the outline's preceding the *Entretiens* is lacking, although for many reasons such dating seems very probable.

The Diderot reader will doubtless note many familiar reflections of the author in this text. There is here the same predilection for grouping and concentrated action as in *Jacques le fataliste*, to a lesser extent in the *Neveu* and in general throughout the *Salons* and *Correspondance*. On the lyric stage, just as in literature and painting, Diderot continues to give privileged importance to what one might call the plastic moment within a background of intense movement and action. It is the artist's duty not only to motivate the group activity, but to know how, at any given point in the duration of such activity, to freeze that grouping, as in a cinematic frame.¹⁰ Moreover, as he suggests in the *Entretiens*, opera is a composite of several art forms. Although necessarily more complex, it can also be more concentrated and powerful. The secret is to combine all those disparate elements—ballet, music, singing, characterization and action—in the optimum fashion to permit each medium to give its best and yet contribute to a total effect which becomes another medium. Thus Diderot, in the present sketch, has decided that the operatic librettist should arrange mass or group scenes. Such thinking was not foreign to his other writing, but it seems particularly pertinent to opera. This group presentation achieves first of all the ring of reality since here it replaces life in the fabled regions by life in the streets. It makes possible interesting dance arrangements, powerful choral effects and the colorful *tableaux* for which Diderot wanted tunes which imitated the "principal phenomena of nature." In this insistence on the importance of the chorus, he was not following a common practice in most of the comic opera of the times. On the contrary, a comparison of the *plan* with Rousseau's *Devin* will show how far he has strayed from the successful model.

A. Oliver in *The Encyclopedists as Critics of Music* seems convinced that Diderot held the theory that music should take the "upper hand" in opera. The assertion needs clarification particularly in light of the sketch for an opera published here for the first time. Like the other Encyclopedists in the *Coin de la reine* Diderot looked upon the invasion of Italian music as a lesson to French opera. Like most of his friends, he admired the talents of both Rameau and Lulli. But, as Oliver very aptly puts it at the beginning of his discussion of the problem, "Diderot was the only critic who saw that both camps were fumbling in the dark." For the question

10. "Il [the author of an *Essai sur un nouveau genre de spectacle à Florence*, being reviewed by Diderot:] appelle à son secours l'homme de talent qui sache ménager à la scène des plans ingénieux et donner aux groupes de personnages et de la pantomime une disposition vraiment pittoresque." *Œuvres complètes A-T* VIII, 463.

of musical superiority was even then secondary to the more profound question (as Oliver again puts it) "how aptly does the music in either case (Terradellas vs. Lulli) interpret the dramatic situation?" Here is the crucial point which becomes in effect the kernel of the discussion in the later *Entretiens*. There is no question of the musician's having the upper hand; what Diderot, in his writings and in the present outline, is aiming at is the marriage of poetry and music to form another medium which will be neither the classic declamation of a Racine nor yet the pure music of a Rameau. Certainly Diderot would have handled the plight of Colette differently had he been writing literature not a libretto; we do not have to look far for the kind of profusion of language (*Eloge de Richardson, La Religieuse*) which he would have used in another medium. He tells us how Racine ought to be set to music "Barbares, arrêtez etc. . . ."¹¹ But the more perfect solution would clearly be a different kind of declamation from the poet's, with the potentialities of the musician in mind—something like the simple refrain of "À boire" in the sketch. It is unnecessary here to become involved in the problem of "egg or chicken first" evoked by any composer-librettist collaboration. It does seem necessary to point out a certain inconsistency in Oliver's later discussion of Diderot's "ideal opera" when he says that Gluck "identified his music with the theories of Diderot and the Encyclopedists" and when he sees a Machiavellian Gluck with tongue in cheek declaring "I sought to reduce music to its true function, which is to enhance poetry." The sketch of the *opéra-comique* published here only adds conviction to the feeling that Diderot is not to be grouped at all times with the other Encyclopedists in his discussion of opera; that the Gluck who could write the music for "Che farò senza Euridice" was not necessarily Machiavellian in his statement that he let the poetry guide his musical line. What Diderot wanted and what Gluck gave was not so simply the triumph of music over dramatic language and emotion as the interpenetration of two arts and the marriage of "lines" of expression of two artists. The careless use of any available melody which would fit the words was the contemporary abuse Diderot hoped to reform, as well as the passage of pure music, however sublime, which took no interest in the dramatic action. Thus Oliver's momentary feeling that Diderot's operatic poetry "would seem to presage Mozart rather than Gluck" misinterprets Diderot's basic direction of reform. Both Gluck and Mozart were moving in that direction, but it is romantic opera of the next century which comes closer to his ideal opera.

Whatever the intrinsic value of the present sketch, Diderot seems again to have foreseen the natural development of his medium. He has approached in his libretto the general spirit of nineteenth-century opera, particularly Italian. Diderot's opera finds echoes in Donizetti's *L'Elisir d'Amore* and

11. *Œuvres complètes A-T* VII, 162 ff. Also cited in A. Oliver, op. cit. supra.

in folk, therefore group, opera like Smetana's *Die verkaufte Braut*. He would have been extremely sympathetic to the whole *verismo* movement in Italian opera. One must suppose that he would have understood and warmly approved such a chorus-opera, with the insistence on the "primary phenomenon," on the people, and with the lavish display of every medium as Moussorgsky's *Boris Godunov* or *Khovanschina*. One might say, judging in terms of the 1750's, that Diderot had written a bad comic opera outline, and that he was writing more for the theatre than for the existing lyric stage. In retrospect, it seems safe to believe that he wrote a bad outline consciously and purposely because he was convinced that theatre was still the base upon which the other arts must be grouped in order to achieve the highest potential of opera.

University of California, Berkeley

PLAN D'UN OPÉRA COMIQUE

INÉDIT DE DIDEROT¹

Le theatre represente une foire.

Le fond et les cotés sont occupés par des boutiques de marchands.

Le devant des boutiques est une place.

A gauche est la Taverne de Blaise, parrein de Colette.

A droite, la boutique de Richard, marchand forain et tuteur de Colette.

Les marchands et les marchandes appellent les chalands qui passent.

Scene 1ere

Caquet des marchands et des marchandes qui appellent les chalands . . .
 "C'est ici les beaux ceinturons . . . Monsieur, un noeud d'épée . . . Un petit chapeau, madame. C'est la bonne faiseuse . . . etc" (A faire d'après nature, a la foire St. Germain.)

1. An attempt has been made to reproduce integrally the text of the original with two exceptions. The punctuation is my own as well as the capitalization. What Fabre (in the critical edition of the *Neveu*) had to say as to Diderot's addiction to careless slips in copying and his arbitrary capitalization and punctuation is equally true for the manuscript of the *plan*. I have marked with *sic* only those passages and errors which might have raised doubts in the reader's mind, and I have put between brackets my own suggestions for the rare lacunae of Diderot in his copying. Although it seems probable that the *plan* was not subjected to the same recopying and correction of his more important works, there is but one point of ambiguity. That Diderot meant the shop of Blaise to be rifled by the *bateleurs*, there is no doubt, but he was probably confusing Blaise and Richard when he has them slip into Blaise's shop and leave contraband goods (Act 2, Scene 7). After all, the contraband goods are an important part of the general accusation against Richard and the trumped-up case would be weakened should Blaise also seem guilty of dealing in contraband goods.

Scene 2

Richard dans sa boutique, Colin, Colette sur la porte de la boutique de Richard.

Colette—Vilain tuteur, mechant tuteur; rendez-moi mon bien. Je veux me marier.

Richard—Vous n'etes pas en age.

Colin—Monsieur Richard, rendez a Colette son bien.

Richard—Tenez, allez.

Colin—Colette m'aime.

Richard—Je l'aime aussi.

Colin—Mais elle ne veut point de vous. N'est-ce pas, Colette?

Colette—Non, non. Je n'en veux point.

Colin—Et elle veut de moi.

Richard—Je le crois; mais c'est moi qu'elle epousera.

Colette—Ah! J'en mourrai.

Colin—Vous entendez. Elle en mourra.

Richard—Oh, que non! C'est bon pour le discours.

Colin—C'est moi qu'elle aime.

Colette—C'est lui que j'aime.

Richard—Et c'est moi qu'on epousera.

Colette—Mon tuteur; mon cher tuteur.

Colin—Monsieur Richard . . .

Les deux amoureux le supplient. Richard est inflexible, et les deux amoureux, depites, lui jettent toute sa marchandise au nez et le chargent d'injures.

Richard—(a Colin) Fais et dis ce que tu voudras. J'ai son bien; j'aurai sa personne. (a Colette) Tu m'epouseras, tu m'epouseras.

Scene 3

Colin, Colette en s'avancant sur la scene.

Colette—Tu vois combien il est dur. Eh bien, Colin, qu'allons-nous devenir? . . . Cependant le tems presse. (Colette est un peu grosse.)

Les deux amoureux se desolent. Ils projettent de se sauver bien loin s'ils ne reussissent pas d'une ou d'autre facon a toucher Richard. Cependant, Colin propose a Colette de lui donner sa foire.

Ils s'aprouchent des boutiques des marchands dont le charivari recommencent (*sic*). Ils se disputent, Colin et Colette. Ils s'injurient.

Cependant Blaise le cabaretier, a moitie yvre, sort de sa taverne en chantant le refrain d'un rond de table.

Scene 4

Colin, Colette dans une boutique, et son parrein, Blaise le tavernier.

Blaise—Pardieu, ces gens que j'ai la n'engendrent pas melancolie. Ils

2. ? *n'est ce pas colette*, in ms.

boivent mon vin; ils mangent mon jambon; ils cajolent ma fille; ils caressent ma femme; et ils n'ont peut-être pas le sou. Mais ils sont gais. Entendez-vous le train qu'ils font?

(En effet, on entend dans la taverne un charivari de buveurs. Les uns crient—"Holaho, garçon! Du vin! Du vin!"... "On y va, on y va..." Les autres chantent "a boire, a boire; partirons-nous sans boire; partirons-nous sans boire un coup.")

Et Blaise, sur la scène, se met à faire chorus avec eux et à chanter "a boire, a boire; partirons-nous sans boire, etc..." puis, il continue.

[Blaise]—Ils sont les maîtres chez moi. Ah, ce sont les meilleurs gens du monde, "Notre hôte, notre cher hôte, vous vous asseurez (*sic*) là." Il a fallu s'asseoir, il a fallu s'enivrer, car foi de Dieu, je suis un peu yvre. Si je ne gagne rien avec eux, du moins je ris; je me dédommage avec d'autres et je ne me morfonds pas comme ces pauvres diables là... "A boire, a boire, partirons-nous sans boire"... Mais voilà ma filleul (*sic*) et son amoureux... La voilà toute chargée de colifichets. Elle les a bien payés, si ce qu'on dit est vrai. Il vient tant de gens chez moi. Quand ils sont gris, ils jament, et moi je ne suis pas sourd. Mais, après tout, qu'est-ce [que] ça me fait? Je ne suis que son parrein... Si c'étoit ma fille, ventrebleu... Oh, je n'entends pas raison... Ah, quand une fille perd son père et sa mère, on ne sait plus ce que cela devient. Mais je me porte bien. Bonjour, Colette. Comment, te voilà parée comme un (*sic*) chasse, et jolie comme un cœur. (En lui passant la main sur son tablier) Tu prens de l'embonpoint à vue d'œil. Colin est galand. (Colin et Colette ne lui répondent rien; ils ont l'air triste.)

[Blaise]—Eh! que diable avez-vous? Est-ce que vous vous boudez déjà? A boire, a boire! Eh, mes enfants, chantez. A boire, a boire. Quand vous serez mariés vous aurez du tems de suite pour vous boudier.

Ariette contre le mariage.

Blaise n'aime pas le mariage et donneroit deux femmes pour une barreau⁴ de vin.—"Vous vous aimez donc, toujours. C'est fort bien fait. Continuez, soyez gais et ne vous mariez pas. A boire, a boire, a boire.

Colin et Colette ne sont pas de son avis. Ils chantent la nécessité du mariage.

Blaise—Eh bien! Mariez-vous. J'y consens; mariez-vous.

Colin et Colette—Nous le voudrions bien; mais nous ne le pouvons pas. Richard...

Blaise—Richard? Après? Je ne l'aime pas; il [a] cependant tenu un de

3. This refrain shows up in Madame d'Epinay's *Mémoires* (ed. Roth, Paris: Gallimard, 1951. II, 402) in precisely the chapter where P.-M. Masson ("Mme d'Epinay, Jean-Jacques... et Diderot chez Mlle Quinault" in *Annales Jean-Jacques Rousseau* IX, 1913, 1-28) has shown so much more of the hand of Diderot by paralleling the D'Epinay text with his later writings of 1770-80. The date of the incident of Mlle Quinault's dinner has been fairly conclusively put in the Spring of 1754. However, the chronology of the *Mémoires* is not always coincident with fact, nor was it meant to be.

4. Popular diminutive made on *une barrote* (baril)? Cf. Perigourdine *barleto*.

mes enfants; mais je ne l'aime pas. C'est une tete de linote; cela ne scait pas boire un coup. A boire, a boire, a boire.

Colin et Colette lui racontent leur deconvenue. . . .

Colette ajoute—Ce (*sic*) que ce n'est pas tout. Il faut tout dire. Tenez, mon parrein (elle pleure) . . . Ah, Colin est bien mechant . . . mais malgre cela, il m'aime toujours. . . . Sans cela, je crois que je me noyerois.

Quand Blaise a bien entendu, son avis est que Colette epouse Richard.

Colette—Dans l'etat ou je suis?

Blaise—Sans doute.

Colette—Et Colin?

Blaise—Il continuera d'etre ton amoureux.

Colette—N'y scavez-vous que cela?

Blaise—Ma foi, non; et puis, a boire, a boire, a boire. (Et l'on repete avec lui dedans la taverne: "A boire, a boire, a boire; partiron-nous sans boire un coup.")

Colette—Mais mon parrein, qu'est-ce donc que ces gens la que vous avez chez vous?

Blaise—Que diable le scait? Mais ils sont droles. Pardieu ils pourroient vous servir. Je n'aime pas Richard, rien n'est plus vrai; et ces droles la en savent long. Je vais les faire venir.

Au meme instant, les hotes de Blaise qui sont une troupe de bateleurs sortent de la taverne, poursuivant la femme et la fille de Blaise.

Scene 5

Colin, Colette, Blaise. La femme et la fille de Blaise, et les bateleurs qui les poursuivent.

La femme de Blaise—A moi, Blaise.

La fille de Blaise—A moi, mon pere.

Blaise—Eh! laissez-les faire. Ils ne vous nuiront pas . . . (Il les prend tous par la main et les fait danser en rond.) Puis il ajoute—Morgue, ce n'est pas tout. Vous etes venu (*sic*) tout a tems; vous qui scavez tout, ne scauriez-vous pas quelques moyens de secourir ces enfants-la?

La fille et la femme de Blaise—Ah, secourez-les! Colette est la meilleure creature du monde.

Un des bateleurs—(en embrassant Colette) Eh, vraiment, oui.

La fille de Blaise—C'est ma bonne amie.

Un autre bateleur—(en embrassant Colette) Ah, puisque c'est votre bonne amie . . . De quoi s'agit-il? . . .

Blaise—Ils veulent se marier.

Le bateleur—Nous les marierons.

Blaise—En depit de Richard?

Le bateleur—En depit de Richard.

La femme de Blaise et sa fille—En verité?

Le bateleur—Nous en avons bien vu d'autres . . . Et qui est ce Richard?

Fut-il le diable, nous en viendrons a bout. Tenez, en voila deux qui font les temoins depuis plus de vingt ans. Celui-cy sera le pere. Celui-la sera la mere. S'il faut un grand-pere, nous en avons vu; et je serai le notaire.

Blaise—Il ne s'agit ni de pere ni de mere ni de grand mere; mais de tromper Richard qui est un sot, que je n'aime pas, qui ne scait pas boire, qui est le tuteur de Colette.

Le bateleur—Ah! de Colette! (Il se retourne et la baise.)

Blaise—Qui a son bien, qui ne veut pas le lui rendre et qui veut l'epouser.

Le bat.—Le Richard en aura merit , et rendra le bien, et n'epousera pas. Epouser Colette, un Richard! Cela ne se peut. (Il la baise.)

Et les autres bateleurs en baisant Colette, la femme de Blaise et sa fille repetent tous—Cela ne se peut. Nous detestons Richard. C'est un sot, c'est un animal qui ne scait pas boire. Qu'est-il?

Blaise—Il est marchand.

Le bat.—Ou demeure-t-il?

La fille de Blaise—La. Au coin. Tenez, le voila sur sa porte.

Le bat.—Quoi! Ce grand nigau-la?

Blaise—Lui-meme.

Tous les bat.—C'est un sot, c'est un animal, que nous detestons, que nous tromperons, qui ne scait pas boire. (En chantant ce refrain, ils baisent les femmes.)

Blaise—Tenez parole et nous boirons. J'ai dans ma cave un tonneau de vin grec; oui, vin grec. Nous le mettrons en perce, et nous ne quitterons pas la table qu'il ne soit a sec.

Les bat.—Laissez-nous faire. Retirez-vous.

Scene 6

Un des bateleurs—Que ferons-nous?

Un autre—Commençons par l'attirer a nous. Voila sa porte. Tournons nos tretaux de son cot . Nous ferons tant, qu'il faudra bien qu'il vienne. Et s'il ne vient pas, nous nous retournerons. Mais debutons par la.

(Ils disent un mot de la femme de Blaise et de sa fille. Ils voudroient bien jouer deux sots au lieu d'un.)⁵

Les autres bat.—C'est fort bien dit. Allons camarades, a l'ouvrage.

On apporte des tonneaux, des planches, des tretaux. Ils dressent leurs echafauts en mesure, en musique, et en pantomimes. Un des bateleurs se laissent (*sic*) tomber. Ses camarades le secourent. Il a l'air bris . Mais bientot il se releve. Il est alerte et gai. (Ce n'etoit qu'un jeu pour faire venir Blaise qui vient en effet au secours du pretendu bless . Cependant, deux de ces brigands caressent sa femme et sa fille; ce qu'on voit aux fenestres de la taverne.)⁶ Tous s'en rejouissent. Ils sortent en dansant, et l'acte finit.

5. Written in margin of ms., opposite above paragraph.

6. Written in margin to follow *gai*.

*Acte 2**Scene 1ere*

Les bateleurs montent sur leurs treteaux. Ils chantent des vaudevilles. Ils raclent du violon. La populace et les marchands s'attroupent autour d'eux et chantent avec eux. Ils ont des secrets pour tous. On voit a cote d'eux un grand tableau. C'est l'histoire d'une jeune fille qu'ils ont rendue amoureuse.

—Ici, messieurs, vous la voyez qui devient reveuse. Ici, vous la voyez qui regarde avec plaisir celui qu'elle ne pouvoit souffrir. Ici, vous la voyez qui rebute celui qu'elle aimoit. Ici, vous la voyez qui demande pardon a genoux, oui messieurs, a genoux vous la voyez, a celui qu'elle haïssoit. La voila qui le demande pour mari a ses parents; voila le pere, voila la mere. Ils sont fort etonnes, comme vous voyez.

Voila qu'on les marie.

Et puis les vaudevilles recommencent, et le chorus des marchands et autres gens qui sont autour d'eux.

Scene 2

Le bateleur et Richard.

La foule se retire. Le bateleurs descendent de leurs treteaux. Richard, qui a entendu qu'ils ont un sceret (*sic*) pour se faire aimer, reste. Il s'adresse a l'un d'eux. Il paroit d'abord n'avoir pas trop de foi au sceret (*sic*); c'est qu'il a quelque honte de dire ce qu'il veut. A la fin, il le dit et le bateleur lui repond—Ce n'est pas mon district. Moi, je fais telle chose.

Richard s'adresse [à] un second qui lui repond aussi—Ce n'est pas mon district. Moi, je fais telle chose.

Richard s'adresse a un troisieme et ainsi de suite, de couplets satyriques en couplets satyriques.

Enfin, il en vient un qui lui dit—Oui, c'est moi qui dispose des coeurs. (L'ariette burlesque sur son admirable talent est faite.)

Le bateleur—Vous voulez donc vous faire aimer?

Richard—Si, je le veux.

Le bateleur—Et quel age avez-vous?

Richard—Mais, j'ai la cinquantaine.

Le bateleur—La chose est difficile. Quel age a celle que vous aimez?

Richard—A peu pres dix-huit ans.

Le bateleur—Dix-huit ans en aimer cinquante! La chose est difficile. En aime-t-on un autre?

Richard—Helas, oui.

Le bateleur—La chose est difficile. Et celui-la, quel age a-t-il?

Richard—Environ vingt ans.

Le bateleur—Vous demandez le diable. Cependant, on vous satisfera. Mais l'ami parlez. Avez-vous du courage?

Richard—Je n'en manque pas; et puis, pour etre aime de Colette et garder sa dote qui sera forte que ne fercis-je pas?

Le bateleur—Vous vous rendrez ici.

Richard—Je m'y rendrai.

Le bateleur—La nuit.

Richard—La nuit.

Le bateleur—Sous l'habit qu'on vous donnera.

Richard—Comme on voudra.

Le bateleur—Vous souffrirez tout ce qu'on vous fera.

Richard—Je souffrirai.

Le bateleur—Sans mot dire.

Richard—Sans mot dire. Mais apres cela Colette m'aimera.

Le bateleur—A la folie.

Richard—A la folie. Colette m'aimera a la folie. (Il en saute d'aise.)

Le bateleur—Seigneur Richard, halte la. Je vous avertis qu'au premier mot qui vous echapera, vous aurez le col tort, vous etes mort.

Richard—Rien ne m'echapera. Colette m'aimera!

Le bateleur—Seigneur Richard, halte la.

Richard—Qu'est [-ce] donc encore qu'il y a?

Le bateleur—Quand Colette vous aimera, si de deux heures vous lui faites la moindre caresse, vous etes mort, vous aurez le col tort.

Richard—Deux heures! C'est bien du tems; mais je m'y resoudrai.

Le bateleur—Pas un mot. Et de deux heures apres, pas la moindre caresse.

Richard—Cela s'entend. Tout est dit.

Le bateleur—Allez donc quitter (*sic*) cet habit, et revenez.

Scene 3

Blaise, sa femme, sa fille, Colin, Colette. Les autres bateleurs.

Tous—Eh bien, eh bien?

Le bat.—Il est pris, il est pris. (Aux bat.) Qu'un de vous se tienne pret, quand je l'appellerai ... mais il revient. Sauvez-vous tous.

Scene 4

Le bateleur et Richard.

Le bateleur—Vous voila bien. ... (Il appelle) Hola ho ... (Un camarade paroit.) ... Un habit.

Le camarade—Quel habit? Est-ce celui sous lequel on fait fortune?

Le bat.—Non.

Le camarade—Celui sous lequel on rajeunit?

Le bat.—Non.

Le camarade—Celui sous lequel on embellit?

Le bat.—Non, c'est celui sous lequel on plait. Avec celui-la on est tou-

jours assez riche, assez jeune, assez beau. N'est-il pas vrai, seigneur Richard?

Richard—D'accord, mais les deux autres ne me déplairoient pas. Mais cet habit sous lequel on plait, croyez-vous qu'il aille a ma taille?

Le bat.—S'il (*sic*) ira.

Scene 5

Un bateleur, Richard et tous les autres qui apportent l'habit sous lequel on plait.

La prise d'habit. Cette scene sera si folle qu'on voudra. Je voudrais qu'on la fit en italien ou en langue franque.

Il n'y a que le bonnet qu'on ne lui met pas. On le lui donne. Si tot qu'il sera nuit, et qu'il entendra une voix qui l'apellera, alors il s'en affublera. Il sortira et on le conduira—on, tous. Le reste se fera.

Scene 6

Comme il est sur le point de sortir, Colette vient. Elle aperçoit Richard; elle le trouve charmant; elle chante un morceau qui peint je ne sais quoi qui se passe en elle.

Et Richard dit—L'habit opere.

Puis, il se retire en chantant et en sautant d'aise.

Scene 7

Blaise, sa femme, sa fille, Colin et les bateleurs.

Voyant aller Richard et riant tous—Ah, ah, ah.

Le bateleur—Nous le tenons, nous le tenons. Il nous faut des lutins, on n'en peut trop avoir. Et vous nous servirez.

Blaise—Je veux en etre.

Le bateleur—Vous en serez.

La femme de Blaise—Et moi donc?

Le bat.—Nous avons plus d'une chose a faire; vous resterez; nous vous trouverons de l'emploi.

La femme de Blaise—Je voudrais bien en etre.

La fille de Blaise—Maman, il faut laisser faire ces messieurs.

Blaise—Elle a raison.

Le bat.—Allez donc tous vous preparer.

Ils sortent excepté quelques uns des camarades du bateleur a qui il ordonne, lorsque Blaise⁷ sortira de sa boutique de s'y glisser et de le demenager, sans qu'on s'en apercoive. Le reste ira comme il pourra; ce sera toujours autant de pris. Ce n'est pas tout: et de mettre a la place de ses effets quelque marchandise de contrebande. Ce complot fait, ils se retirent. La nuit vient. Les boutiques de la foire se ferment, et le caquet

7. *Richard* seems the better reading here.

des marchands entr'eux recommencent (*sic*). Les uns n'ont rien fait. Les autres ont vendu et s'en rejouissent, et l'acte finit.

Acte 3

Scene 1ere

Il fait nuit. Colin et Colette entrent deguisés en lutins.

Colin—Si cela pouvoit reussir!

Colette—Que cela reussisse ou non, nous serons vangés.

Colin—Scais-tu ce qu'ils ont resolu?

Colette—Non. Mais ces gens la sont bien adroits. Ecoute, Richard pourroit bien ne pas etre le seul sot de cette aventure-cy; et mon parrein Blaise pourroit bien en tenir aussi.

Colin—Que veux-tu dire?

Colette—Je veux dire que ce n'est pas pour rien que ma marraine et sa fille restent dans la maison. . . . Mais je vois de la lumiere chez Richard. Il me semble que je l'entens.

Colin—Oui, c'est lui.

Scene 2

Colin, Colette, Richard a sa fenetre, chantant son impatience et ses esperances. Colin et Colette lardent sa chanson d'ironies.

Richard—Mais, j'entens quelqu'un (*sic*) . . . oui. Je ne me trompe pas, j'entrevois. . . . Voici le moment. . . . D'aise le coeur me bat. Dans un instant Colette m'aimera. . . . Mais Richard, comment feras-tu pour te refuser a ses caresses. . . . Richard, prends garde a toi.

Scene 3

Colin, Colette, une partie des bateleurs deguisés, Richard a sa fenetre.

Le maitre des ceremonies leur donnent leurs roles. Quelques uns des bateleurs se glissent au long de la boutique de Richard.

Cela fait, le maitre de la bande contrefaisant une voix de sabat, s'approche de la porte de Richard et lui crie:—Richard, Richard, dors-tu? Tu dors, tu ne songes pas a Colette qui commence a bruler pour toi.

En chœur—Eveille-toi, eveille-toi.

Richard repond.

Le bateleur—Mets le bonnet misterieux.

Richard—Il est mis.

Le bateleur—Si tu ne t'en sens pas la force de te taire et de souffrir, ne sors pas.

Richard—Je ne crains rien. Me voila.

Scene 4

Richard sort, le bonnet mysterieux enfonce sur les yeux. . . . Il marche a tatons. . . —Je ne vois goutte. Je ne scais ou je vais. . . . J'entens un

bruit du diable. . . . Non, les oreilles me tinte (*sic*). Je n'entens rien. . . . Il me semble qu'on rit. . . . Seigneur, enchanteur, ou etes-vous? . . . Il me semble que je veux avoir peur. . . . Remettons-nous, ce n'est rien.

A mesure qu'il s'avance, les lutins se rassemblent autour de lui, et l'assaillent d'un vacarme effroyable de voix, de cris et d'instruments. . . . Il fuit. . . . Ces voix (*sic*) le poursuivent. . . . On lui dit—Si tu parles, si tu bouges, tu as le col tort, tu es mort. . . . Il s'arrete tremblant de tous ses membres.

On le prend; on l'assied; on lui fait mille niches. On le berne; on lui donne des camouffets; on le roue de coups. Au milieu de tout cela, il entend la voix de Colette qui lui dit les choses les plus douces et qui l'exhorte a la patience. —Mais tu ne me repons pas. . . . Richard, cruel Richard! Tu ne m'aimes pas.

On le tourmente si violemment qu'a la fin, il se met a crier—Au meurtre, a l'assassin, je suis mort.

Et tous les marchands de la foire, en habit de nuit, des lumieres a la main, paroissent a leurs fenetres, et se mettent a crier—A la garde, a la garde, au meurtre, a l'assassin.

Tous les lutins disparaissent, et Richard reste seul.

Il ne faut pas oublier que pendant cette scene, une partie des bateleurs qui se sont glisses dans sa boutique l'ont demenagée, et qu'il faut encore faire cette scene en italien et en langue franque.

Scene 5

Richard seul.

Il est etendu sur la place. Il se plaint. Il est roué; il est moulu. Il maudit Colette, et la rage qu'il a eu d'en etre aimé—Ah, vieux pendarde que vous etes, vous voulez avoir une epouse de quinze ans; vous retenez sa dote. . . . C'est bien fait. . . . Mais comment regagner ma boutique, etc., etc. . . .

Scene 6

Richard et le maitre bateleur.

Le bateleur—Eh bien, Richard, comment cela s'est-il passé?

Richard lui raconte de la maniere la plus ridicule son aventure; il redit les mots les plus barbares qu'il a entendus—Tant y a que je suis roué, que je suis mort.

Le bateleur—Mais aussi Colette sera folle de vous.

Richard—Ah! malheureux que je suis.

Le bat.—Qu'y a-t-il donc? Auriez-vous parlé?

Richard—Si, j'ai parlé. J'ai crié comme un diable, et qui auroit pu s'en empecher?

Le bat.—Mais la ceremonie etoit-elle presque faite?

Richard—Je le crois.

Le bat.—Il faut esperer que cela n'aura rien gate. . . . Tu n'es pas au bout. . . . Vous pouvez a present quitter le bonnet. . . . (On lui ote le bonnet.) Mais seigneur Richard, qu'est-ce que je vois? . . . Vous avez laissé votre boutique ouverte. . . . La nuit. . . . il y a tant de fripons!

Richard—Que dites-vous? (Il court a sa boutique.)

Lorsqu'il se voit volé, il se roule a terre; il s'arrache les cheveux; il hurle comme un enragé. Il se met a crier a tue-tete:—Au feu, au meurtre, au voleur.

Et les marchands de reparoitre a leur fenêtre avec leur (*sic*) lumieres et de crier—Au voleur, au voleur.

Scene 7

Les bateleurs deguises en archer du guet avec un commissaire a leur tete—Qu'est-ce qu'il y a? Qu'est-ce qu'il y a? Ou sont-ils? De quel cote se sont-ils enfui (*sic*)? Est-ce vous qu'on a volé?

Richard—Je suis perdu, je suis ruiné.

Le commissaire—Or sus, verbalisons. Le vol s'est-il fait avec effraction, etc.

En visitant la boutique de Richard, on y trouve de la contrebande—Qu'est-ce que je vois? Des marchandises prohibées!

Blaise—Qui l'auroit cru? L'ami Richard etoit contrebandier.

La femme et la fille de Blaise—Contrebandier! Misericorde!

On fait sauver Richard. Son bon ami, le maitre bateleur l'entraîne.

Scene 8

Les autres bateleurs se demasquent. On parle du vol. Ils ne savent ce que c'est. De la contrebande. Ils ne savent ce que c'est, mais ils scauront en tirer parti. Une partie des bateleurs entraînent Blaise. Sa femme et sa fille restent avec deux d'entr'eux. La mere gronde sa fille. La fille la menace de dire tout a son pere. Les deux bateleurs racommodent tout, et l'acte finit.

Acte 4

Scene 1ere

Caquet des marchands de la foire, en ouvrant leurs boutiques.

1e marchande—Ma commere, avez-vous entendu le train qu'on a fait toute la nuit? On a crié au feu, au voleur, a la garde.

2e mar.—Si, je l'ai entendu! J'ai reçu cette allarme fort mal a propos dans mon premier somme.

1ere march.—Moi, plus mal a propos encore, quoique je fusse fort eveillée. Vous ne savez donc pas ce que c'est?

3 march.—Je le sais, moi. C'est le voisin Richard, On dit qu'il va au sabat.

4—Il n'a pourtant pas l'air d'un sorcier.

Tous les march.—Ah, ah, ah.

5—On dit que le diable lui a tordu le col.

Un autre march.—Il a bien fait.

1—Bon, c'est bien pis. On l'a volé.

2—Bon, c'est bien pis. On lui a trouvé de la contrebande. Sa boutique en étoit pleine. Il est en fuite.

3—Si on l'attrape, il sera pendu.

4—Sa pupile n'en pleurera pas.

Tous—Ah, ah, ah, ah.

5—Que parlez-vous de contrebandier, de pendu, de sorcier, de sabat? C'est chez le tavernier du coin qu'il se tient. Il faisoit chaud. Je ne pouvois dormir. J'étois à ma fenêtre. Il faut que j'aie vue (*sic*) sortir de chez lui plus de deux mille diables de toutes couleurs.

1—Ah, monsieur Becassin, deux mille! Vous n'en rebatirez pas un!

Tous—Ah, ah, ah.

1—Le tavernier passe pour un bon homme.

2—Oui, mais sa femme et sa fille sont jases (*sic*).

3—Et de qui ne jase-t-on pas? . . . Mais voyons si la journée sera meilleure que celle d'hier. Tenez, voilà un egrillard qui sort de chez Blaise et qui pourroit bien être un des diables de cette nuit.

Scene 2

Le bateleur qui a emmené Richard.

Le bateleur—Le pauvre Richard! Ah, ah, ah! Il est au désespoir. Il vouloit se noyer, se jeter par les fenêtres. Je n'avais qu'à le laisser faire et nous en serions débarrassés. A la douleur d'être volé se joint une frayeur mortel (*sic*) d'être pris comme contrebandier. Il voit le juge Colot. Il voit des archers. Au moindre bruit qu'on fait à la porte ou dans la cour, il crie—Les voilà! Je suis perdu." Il court; il ne sait où se fourrer. Il se jette sous le lit. . . . Mais tout dort encore chez notre hôte . . . (Il frappe à la porte de Blaise). . . . Allons donc! Debout! Debout!

Scene 3

Le bateleur, la femme de Blaise à une fenêtre et sa fille à l'autre.

La femme de Blaise—Voulez-vous finir? Mon mari dort.

La fille de Blaise—Voulez-vous finir? Mon père dort. Voulez-vous nous perdre?

La femme de Blaise—Paix, Paix.

La fille de Blaise—Chut, chut. On va vous ouvrir.

Le bat.—Quelques uns de mes camarades ont mieux passé la nuit que moi.

Scene 4

Le bateleur, Colin, Colette.

Colette—Eh bien, monsieur? Vous a-t-il remis mon bien?

Colin—Permet-il que j'épouse Colette?
 Le bat.—Il est bien loin de là. Il prétend que vous l'avez volé. mais cela n'est pas vrai.
 Colin—Oh, pour cela non.
 Le bat.—Il prétend que c'est vous qui avez mis de la contrebande dans sa boutique. Mais cela n'est pas vrai.
 Colette—Oh, pour cela non.
 Le bat.—Il veut vous faire un proces, vous faire interroger, arreter.
 Colin, Colette—Nous faire arreter!
 Le bat.—Oui. Voyez là. Mettez la main sur la conscience.
 Colin, Colette—Monsieur, nous etions avec vous. Vous avez tout vu. Et vous nous servirez de temoin.

Scene 5

Le bateleur, Colin, Colette, Blaise, sa femme, sa fille.
 La femme de Blaise au bat.—Vous avez pensez (*sic*) nous faire de belles affaires. Si mon mari n'avoit pas encore ete un peu gris de la veille. . .
 La fille de Blaise—Est-ce qu'on eveille les gens comme cela?
 Blaise—Je ne veux pas etre cocu, morbleu; cela ne me convient pas. A mon age! Que diable etes-vous donc devenues toute la nuit?
 La femme de Blaise—J'étois allée coucher a cote de votre fille.
 Blaise—C'est fort bien fait. Mais est-ce vrai?
 La femme de Blaise—Demande-lui.
 La fille de Blaise—Ah, mon papa, rien n'est plus vrai. . . Eh bien, l'ami, et Richard?

Scene 6

Les memes et les autres bateleurs.
 Deux bat.—(L'un a la femme de Blaise, l'autre a sa fille)—Comment cela s'est-il passe?
 La femme de Blaise et sa fille—Fort bien, fort bien. Paix. Et Richard?
 Le bateleur en chef—Il se croit poursuivi par (*sic*) les gardes. Je l'ai déterminé a se deguiser en femme. Il doit etre habille. Il ne tardera pas a paroitre. Amis, vous m'entendez. Et vous, Colette, souvenez-vous quand il en sera tems, que vous etes amoureuses (*sic*) de lui. Mais le voici. . . Sauvez-vous tous.

Scene 7

Le bateleur et Richard, deguise en femme, tout effarouché.
 Le bat.—Vous etes a ravir. Le diable ne vous reconnoitrait pas. Mais qu'avez-vous? Vous etes tout effarouché.
 Richard—Ce sont deux coquins qui m'ont pris pour ce que je ne suis pas.
 Le bat.—Comment! Deja des aventures galantes! Mais, aussi vous etes si jolie.
 Richard—Les voila.

Scene 8

Le bat., Richard et deux autres bateleurs deguisés en jeunes gens qui prennent Richard pour une fille.

Richard—Allons, messieurs. Passez votre chemin. Vous me prenez pour un autre.

Le bat.—Messieurs, c'est une honnête femme.

Les jeunes gens donnent des soufflets au bateleur. Cependant, un d'entr'eux prend Richard pardessus le bras et veut l'emmener.

Scene 9

Les memes, et un troisieme bateleur deguisé.

Ce dernier—Qu'est-ce que cela signifie? C'est ma cousine.

Querelle. On met l'épée a la main. On crie a la garde. Un des bateleurs est jetté sur le quarré. La garde vient. Richard se sauve dans une boutique. On enleve le prétendu mort.

Les marchands—A l'horreur! Mais elle est vieille comme ces rues. Il faut être bien enragé pour se battre pour cela.

Scene 10

Richard sort de la boutique; le bateleur lui dit—Allons vite. Sauvons-nous par ici.

Scene 11

Comme ils vont, ils rencontrent des soldats avec un tambour. On bat la caisse. On crie le signalement de Richard. Cent ecus a gagner a qui le decouvrira.

Scene 12

Les memes, Colin, et Colette.

Colette rebute Colin. Elle aperçoit Richard en femme. Elle se jette a son col. Elle le fait reconnoître.

Tous les marchands de la foire—Et vraiment, oui. Oui, c'est lui. Eh, monsieur Richard, comme vous voila fagoté.

Richard se desesperé. On le saisit. On lui met les menottes. On l'entraîne. Le (*sic*)^s Colette le suit en se desesperant. Richard la charge d'imprecations et l'acte finit.

Acte 5

Richard avec les menottes aux mains et Colette.

Scene 1

Richard charge d'imprecations Colette.

Colette joue l'amour, le desespoir, et lui montre a chaque mot la po-

8. Diderot obviously meant to write *et*.

tence. C'est elle qui l'a fait prendre; s'il est pendu, son cher tuteur, elle ne s'en consolera jamais.

Scene 2

Les bateleurs deguisés en juges, Blaise et Colin, un huissier, un greffier.
On assied Richard sur la sellette. On l'interroge; et on le condame comme mauvais tuteur; sorcier qui va au sabat, et qui employe l'art de diablerie pour se faire aimer des filles, et comme contrebandier, a etre pendu jusqu'a ce [que] mort s'ensuive.

Scene 3

Les memes et Colette qui se jette aux pieds des juges et qui demande grace pour Richard.

Les juges—Non, non, point de grace,
Point de quartier.
C'est un mauvais tuteur;
C'est un sorcier.
C'est un contrebandier.
La loi ne permet pas qu'il vive.
Il faut qu'il soit pendu jusqu'a ce
Que mort s'ensuive.

Scene 4

Richard seul. Son desespoir. Pauvero Tracollo. Gia l'anima s'en va etc.⁹

Scene 5

Richard, un creancier, son barbier et un charpentier avec sa toise.
Le creancier lui apporte un billet qui echoit ce jour-la.
Son barbier vient le raser; c'est le dernier jour du mois.
Le charpentier le suit avec sa toise pour prendre sa mesure.

Scene 6

Les bateleurs, deguisés en archers, avec tout le cortège de la justice patibulaire.

Richard demande grace.

On la lui accorde: a condition qu'il rendra a Colette son bien. Il y consent.

a condition qu'il payera a Colette les cent ecus promis a celui ou celle qui le fera reconnoitre. Cela lui paroît dur, mais il y consent.

a condition qu'il renoncera a jamais a aller au sabat et a se faire aimer des filles; il y consent.

a condition qu'il payera l'amende pour la contrebande; il y consent.

a condition qu'il payera les frais de justice, qui se monte (*sic*) a peu pres a ce qu'on a dépensé chez Blaise; il y consent.

9. The original text of the Pergolesi opera: *Povero Tracollo. Già l'anima sen va.*

On lui fait signer toutes conditions, et, a l'instant, tous les masques tombent, et il reconnoit les bateleurs, Blaise, Colin et Colette.

Il crie aux fripons, aux coquins. Il en appelle. Il n'y a appel qui vaille.

Scene 7

Au milieu des cris de Richard, entre la femme de Blaise, poursuivant d'injures un des bateleurs et sa fille qu'elle a surprise . . . qu'elle a surprise . . . comment dire cela? Blaise entre furieux.

Richard se¹⁰ console et l'on conclut un second mariage. Les marchandises volées a Blaise et les epices sont la dote de la fille de Blaise . . . et l'acte finit.

Divertissement

La nuit vient. Les marchands de la foire se rassemblent avec des instruments a corde et de percussion, et donnent un charivari a Blaise et a sa femme sur laquelle il y a bien quelque chose a dire.

a Colin et Colette qui etoit un peu pressée de se marier.

au bateleur et sa femme.

et au pauvre Richard qui a fait les frais de tout.

Blaise et sa femme, Colin et Colette, le bateleur et sa femme, Richard paroissent a leurs fenetres, inondent d'un deluge d'eau les donneurs de charivari qui s'enfuient—et le divertissement finit.

FIN

10. A possible and better reading in the context—*le*.

REVIEW ARTICLE

FLAUBERT'S CORRESPONDENCE

By B. F. Bart

THE long-awaited *Supplément* to Flaubert's *Correspondance* has at last been published.¹ It represents the fruitful collaboration over many years of some of the foremost French students of Flaubert; the four volumes are the indispensable complement to the original nine of the Conard edition.

An introductory note (pp. i-xii) presents the work. The editors acknowledge at the start that no publication of Flaubert's letters will ever be definitive as more letters will no doubt still come to light from time to time: the present collection, however, is rich enough to keep admirers of Flaubert satisfied and scholars busy for many years. There are, it is true, no startling changes to be made in the general picture of Flaubert, yet many nuances can now be added or altered and innumerable new details are revealed. There are some thirteen hundred letters in the four volumes: only a quarter of them are from the period 1830-63; but the *Supplément* almost doubles the letters available for the rest of the sixties and is even richer for the following decade. There is new light on his early relations with his family, particularly during the years in Paris while he tried to study for the law; eighteen new letters add information on his long journey through the eastern Mediterranean lands; there are important additions to our knowledge of his relations to his niece, particularly concerning the financial imbroglio for which she and her husband were responsible; several friends emerge from a half-light, especially Jules Duplan; and there are one hundred and fifty letters to Edmond Laporte, a group of charmingly flirtatious ones to Mme Brainne, as well as some to Bouilhet and twenty-three to Taine, many of prime importance. The first letter is the earliest one known, a New Year's greeting to his grandmother on January 1, 1830; the last letter was written five days before his death. While some of this new material consists of notes whose substance would, today, be conveyed in a rapid telephone call to arrange an appointment, many of the others bring the intimate contact with a strong and lovable personality, the enjoyment of a style which never sins by understatement, and the vivid penetration into the age, which are already familiar from the earlier nine volumes.

The editors offer corrections of some earlier readings of letters already

1. *Œuvres complètes de Gustave Flaubert. Correspondance. Supplément.* Recueillie, classée et annotée par René Dumesnil, Jean Pommier et Claude Digeon. Paris: Conard, 1954. Four vols., pp. xii + 343; 319; 365; 362. Although the four new volumes are not numbered, it seems simplest to give references to them as though they were. All references to volume and page without further indication (e.g., I, 103) will be to the *Supplément*; references to the nine volumes of the original *Correspondance* (Paris, 1926-1933) will be preceded by the indication "Corr."

published elsewhere, additions to certain known letters, and judicious annotations. Some of the notes clarify allusions or references which are no longer understandable except to the specialist.² Others relate the text of the letters to the novels whenever they are directly involved (e.g., I, 160, n. 2), or when (and here the editors have been most perceptive) an experience recounted in the letters seems to lie at the source of some element in later novels (e.g., I, 30, n. 2; I, 102, n. 2). Similarly the editors have provided references to and even citations from the original nine volumes where they are useful; they have also been able to suggest an occasional new dating for some of these letters in the earlier edition and to correct or supplement them in a number of cases.³ Further footnotes provide bits of Flaubertiana when they are relevant or add a living touch to otherwise uninteresting material. Thus (III, 113), in connection with a reference to attending the baptism of the young Charpentier, a note adds that Flaubert was adamant in refusing to allow the infant to be named Antoine despite the protests of the child's parents! On other occasions, though, the editors frustrate their readers' curiosity. At one point (I, 225, n. 2), they refer to a letter to Flaubert as being worth citing *in extenso*; they add that it shows how, perhaps, *Salammô* would not have been written except for the French conquest of Algeria: but they content themselves with quoting only a few extracts which in no way bear out this intriguing assertion. No doubt it is well founded, but one would like to know in what way.

The mass of new material is overwhelming and will require many years fully to assess, but some of its broader lines are readily discernible.⁴ A somewhat clearer picture of Flaubert's relations with the Colliers emerges from the numerous new letters to his sister Caroline, in which he speaks

2. This sort of annotation is, of course, endlessly possible and readers will enjoy adding their own. Thus when Flaubert writes of having been particularly pleased by seeing the pyramids and adds, "quoique je n'y aie pas vu les quarante siècles" (I, 103), he is of course alluding to Napoleon's address to his soldiers in Egypt.

3. A list of these would have been more than convenient; there is none and owners of the original set or scholars using library copies must painstakingly leaf through all the present volumes, perusing the notes to discover these corrections. One such correction, only partially footnoted, clarifies the otherwise mystifying selections given in *Corr.*, VI, 335-338, as fragments from two letters "A une amie." The "amie" is Mme Braine and the selections come from letters given in the *Supplément*. In the order of their occurrence in the *Corr.*, the fragments in the first letter come from *Supplément*, III, 258, 316-317, 323, 315, and 317. As had been noted earlier, the first two fragments of the second letter are themselves reprinted correctly in *Corr.*, VIII, 174-175. The remaining two fragments of this letter come from *Supplément*, III, 210 and 325. One wonders why these were not all footnoted in the *Supplément*. And there are other oddities: e.g., identification of persons named in the letters is not always made on the first appearance of the name.

4. A considerable number of the letters reproduced here have been published before. The most important are those to Turgenev, edited by Gérard-Gailly (Monaco: Editions du Rocher, 1946), to Raoul-Duval, edited by Georges Normandy (Paris: Albin Michel, 1950), and to Maxime Du Camp and others, edited by Auriant (Sceaux: Palimugre, 1948). As they are already familiar, little need be said here concerning their contents.

frequently of calling upon them.⁵ More informative, though, is the series to Henriette Collier. The extreme financial difficulties of the English family appear quite soon (I, 22). Then, after Flaubert's Mediterranean trip (1849-51), a poignant melancholy comes into his letters as he seems to realize that this is already a lost love (I, 142-160, especially). His thoughts dwell on the sadness of the relentless passing of time and the loss of friends. Nothing new or startling appears here, but it is good to have the material in Flaubert's own prose rather than in the more pedestrian language used to phrase scholarly guesses.

Flaubert was singularly blessed with a succession of devoted male friends. Little is added by these letters to what was known of his relationship to Bouilhet; there are many new letters, some no more than notes, but no important information seems to derive from them. Jules Duplan, however, brother of Flaubert's lawyer, comes into well-deserved prominence. Numerous charming letters show him as a loyal friend to whom Flaubert wrote frequently. Duplan was endlessly useful in providing documentation for the *Education sentimentale* or even, on one occasion, lending him two *louis* to tide him over a tight moment (I, 328). His last illness and death in 1870 were a fateful augury of what the year was to bring: Flaubert wrote of him as "un ami très intime (mon plus intime avec Bouilhet), un bon vieux confident qui m'était dévoué comme un chien."⁶ It is pleasant to learn more of this heart-warming relationship.

More important, however, is the collection of some one hundred and fifty letters to Edmond Laporte. He was already well known through the original publication of Flaubert's letters, but the present additions show even more of his role as devoted friend and helper. The earliest letter (1866) suggests a tone of pleasant familiarity already; it lasted and grew to a trusting affection which aided Flaubert immeasurably in the difficult days he faced after the financial disasters of his niece. Students of Flaubert will read even the trivial ones with appreciation, for Laporte's devotion to his older friend seemed able to withstand any demand. Much of the burden of locating data for *Bouvard et Pécuchet* fell upon his willing shoulders; he seems never to have tired of searching out material. It was to him that Flaubert gave the manuscript of the *Trois Contes* (III, 335), writing in reply to Laporte's letter of thanks: "Depuis deux ans, mon pauvre vieux, vos visites ont été mon seul divertissement, ou pour mieux dire ma seule consolation. Je vous devais donc quelque chose" (III, 336). With these letters in hand, the final quarrel between the two (which is now much clearer) becomes the more tragic and the role of Flaubert's niece and her husband the more despicable.

Other people, too, come into sharper focus now, and incidents in their

5. One wonders why these letters were withheld from publication till now. There seems to be no obvious reason.

6. II, 221. See also II, 222-224 for other and similar indications.

lives and Flaubert's receive new highlights. There is a letter to Louise Colet from early January, 1854, some three months before the break in their relations. It is a long and closely reasoned critique of *La Servante*, an attempt to dissuade his mistress from publishing it. Flaubert was no doubt right in prefacing it with "Tu vas te révolter" (I, 172); the letter sheds more light on the waning of the liaison. And from June or July of the same year, there is a letter to Bouilhet announcing Flaubert's forthcoming visit to Paris and warning him to say nothing to anyone "de peur des rapports et des relançades" (I, 182). In quite opposite vein, a footnote (I, 184, n. 3) completes the transcription of a letter in the *Correspondance* so that it becomes clear that by August, Flaubert was already launched on an affair with an actress.

Jeanne de Tourbey, a minor figure in the earlier letters, appears more fully here and is the recipient of one poetic love letter from Tunis (I, 239-240). There are also several new letters to Mme Roger des Genettes, Bouilhet's *Sylphide*, and a great number of new letters to George Sand in the same warmly affectionate tone of those published heretofore. They contain, too, vigorous restatements of his basic esthetic tenets: "Voilà mes deux seules critiques; or, elles sont mauvaises, puisque je me place à un autre point de vue que l'auteur, chose qu'on n'a pas le droit de faire" (III, 129). Or again, "Vous avez bien raison de vous appeler un troubadour! *Ma Sœur Jeanne* en est une preuve. Tout le problème est là. Etre troubadour sans être bête. Faire beau tout en restant vrai. Et vous l'avez résolu encore une fois" (III, 130). More deeply moving is Flaubert's reply to her offer to buy Croisset and let him live in it for the rest of his life: this artist in words was as helpless before his emotion as the veriest novice, and one likes him the better for it (III, 219-220).

Scattered through these letters are many statements on esthetics. Often they are no more than rephrasings of theses already quite familiar: "Il ne s'agit pas seulement de voir, il faut arranger et fondre ce que l'on a vu. La Réalité, selon moi, ne doit être qu'un tremplin. Nos amis sont persuadés qu'à elle seule elle constitue tout l'Art. Ce matérialisme m'indigne. . ." (IV, 52). This is a good statement of his position in the later years, and the phrase "la peur sacrée de la Forme" (IV, 84) is perhaps destined to become a cliché in discussing him. It is in the letters to Taine, though, that the most significant contribution of this collection is made. A long and detailed commentary on Taine's *Voyage en Italie* (II, 86-90) opens the series and is filled with Flaubert's admiration for the new work. He was impressed with the writing and with the ideas but wisely demurred at some of Taine's theories which tended to lessen the importance of "*l'Art en soi*" (II, 88). A second letter (II, 90-93) was Flaubert's reply to four questions put to him by Taine concerning the character of his imaginative processes. The questions have long been known (and the editors reproduce them), and two fragments of Flaubert's reply had been published in the earlier Conard

edition (*Corr.*, V, 350), but the new transcription of the entire answer demonstrates that the earlier ones are faulty and deliberately altered. Flaubert stated that imagined objects very quickly become for him quite as valid as objective reality and that he could no longer then distinguish what in his literary creation was external reality from what originated in his own imagination. Here, too, is Flaubert's original text of the statement that he had an arsenic taste in his mouth while writing *Madame Bovary*. Moreover, there were, he asserted, many details which he did not write down: thus, Homais was slightly marked with smallpox. He also indicated his suspicion that memory idealizes reality. And there is a full and correct rendering of the well-known paragraphs on hallucinations. A sequel (II, 94-96) gives more precise and detailed information on them in reply to further queries by Taine. Flaubert wrote at length on the character of his inspiration; the relation to memory is particularly interesting, as is also the assertion that "L'hallucination artistique ne peut porter sur un grand espace, se mouvoir dans un cadre très large" (II, 96).

Writing a critique of Taine's *Graindorge* and *De l'idéal dans l'art* (II, 116-118), Flaubert congratulated him for coming round to the position that the work of art was more than a historical document. It had importance to Flaubert only in so far as it was eternal, which it could be only by representing humanity of all ages. The way to be ideal was to be true, and that could be attained only by choosing and by exaggerating. The proper approach was to "exagérer harmonieusement" (II, 118). A later letter on Taine's *Philosophie de l'art dans les Pays-Bas* expresses his enthusiasm but formulates the strongest objections to Taine's theories of milieu and race because they did not take sufficient account of "l'ingenium de chaque individu, que vous ne pouvez pas définir" (II, 161). The thought was carried further in a letter to Turgenev, where he repeated his belief that Taine did not pay sufficient attention to the work of art in itself (II, 167).

Many details of Flaubert's life are clarified by this material. There is a new letter dated December 20, 1843, a bare two weeks before his fateful accident. The reader has a peculiar sensation of impending fate as he reads of Flaubert's forthcoming return to his home (I, 36-39). There are also a few incidental details concerning the publication of *Madame Bovary*: in one letter Flaubert mentions having threatened the *Revue de Paris* with a law-suit if its editors did not agree to publish his note explaining his position in reference to the deletions that were being made (I, 210). Other details follow (I, 213-221), most of them either familiar or long assumed.

For *Salammbô* it is entertaining to learn that even within a week of correcting proof he was still worrying about the accuracy of details. A letter to his naturalist friend Pouchet put three further questions to him (I, 298)! The famous reply to Froehner is also brought into fuller perspective in a series of letters (I, 311-315): the German scholar's biting criticism would appear to have been linked to a series of maneuvers and countermaneuvers

around the opening of the Musée Campana; and Flaubert was also certain that Louise Colet was in some way involved.

In connection with *Salammô* and with the later works, there are innumerable letters requesting information or reporting on tremendous efforts which he himself made to amass an accurate documentation. Scholars will no doubt find here many new suggestions for source materials. And the sheer energy expended by Flaubert is overwhelming: in one day he reports spending twenty hours going from one place to another in Paris (II, 115); it is true that a letter the next day reduces the figure to fourteen (II, 116), but it remains impressive enough to justify the italics which Flaubert used both times! Even Taine was approached for information needed in *Bouvard et Pécuchet* (IV, 95-96).⁷

Many other aspects of his personality, temperament, and thinking appear throughout the four volumes. His acuteness in political matters continues to be striking. Writing immediately after the Battle of Sadowa, he observed: "Les bons bourgeois qui admiraient tant M. Thiers sont belliqueux, maintenant. On parle comme sous Louis-Philippe de nos 'hontes nationales,' on veut des agrandissements de territoire, sans qu'il en coûte un homme ou un centime,—bien entendu tout cela est pitoyable! La France qui est au fond de son âme catholique m'a l'air attristée de l'abaissement de l'Autriche! Sent-elle vaguement que l'avenir est aux pays protestants? Si d'ici un an ou deux nous ne flanquons pas une pile à la Prusse, ce pays nouveau jouera peut-être plus tard, le rôle de la Macédoine?" (II, 66). In 1872, he gave a clairvoyant analysis of the basic errors of the conservatives in France (III, 67). In 1877 he has still lost none of his capacity for violent dislike: "Deux choses me soutiennent: l'amour de la Littérature et la Haine du Bourgeois,—résumé, condensé maintenant dans ce qu'on appelle le Grand Parti de l'Ordre. Tout seul et dans le silence du cabinet, je me monte le coco, en songeant à Mac-Mahon, Fourtou et Lizot. Après cinq minutes de réflexion, j'en arrive au paroxysme de la Fureur, et ça me soulage. Je suis plus calme, ensuite. Ne croyez pas que je plaisante le moins du monde" (IV, 23).

More than half of the letters are from the last ten years of his life and a tragic note of melancholy hangs over most of them: the war, the painful experience of aging, his anguished wrestling with *Bouvard et Pécuchet*, and, above all, financial troubles darkened many of his days. He had often overspent his income in earlier years; letters as far back as 1866 show this (e.g., II, 70). In 1867, he wrote an amusing letter to his niece explaining that he was out of funds but did not dare to tell his mother so (II, 107). These, though, were no more than minor irritations easily forgotten when once overcome, however frequently they recurred. When, in June and

7. Several letters from 1863 demonstrate the hesitations of Flaubert as he tried to decide whether to write the *Education sentimentale* or *Bouvard et Pécuchet* (I, 319 and 323-324). These support the material already presented by Mme Marie-Jeanne Durrty, *Flaubert et ses projets inédits* (Paris: Nizet, 1950).

July of 1875, the catastrophe came in the affairs of his niece (and thereby in his own), his letters began to show an almost constant note of lassitude, melancholy, and sorrow, which is deeply moving. It is familiar from the letters published earlier, but for this period the new collection brings even more letters than had been known before, and the tragic note becomes dominant. There are numerous letters here to many people, including Ernest Commanville; frequently they can do no more than express his bewilderment at a situation all of whose details he perhaps never learned. The letters to Raoul-Duval, already published separately, have familiarized students of Flaubert with most of the details of this sordid business. There are, however, two new letters of 1875 which indicate that already at this date his friends were trying to get a pension for him. The idea of the humiliation it would entail was, however, so great that he felt constrained to refuse. He did note, though, that if it were possible to find "une sinécure avantageuse," that would be different.⁸ An attempt seems to have been made at once to place him in the Bibliothèque Nationale (III, 205-206). His financial position was considerably worse than the abridged letters of the earlier edition allowed one to suspect; thus on January 12, 1877, he wrote to Commanville that he was down to ten *sous* (III, 303)! Three days later he must have written him in strong terms; the letter is not given, but on the following day he wrote an apology. The reader of today cringes when he reads: "Je regrette ma lettre d'hier au soir, mais je ne m'étais jamais trouvé (depuis mon temps du quartier Latin) dans une pareille détresse. Je n'ai pu envoyer *ma Bonne* à Rouen, n'ayant pas de quoi lui payer le bateau de Bouille" (III, 304). It is easy to understand why his niece Caroline was not anxious to have this letter published during her lifetime; one wonders why she did not burn it. The faithful Laporte was tireless in trying to help, but the catastrophe was beyond remedy.⁹ The new letters permit the reconstruction of many of the vain efforts made by Flaubert, by Caroline and her husband, and by Flaubert's friends to save the Commanville financial situation. Knowing their outcome makes these pages (III, 346 to end, and IV, *passim*) very sad reading. Flaubert's goodness of heart, his intense family pride, his despair before the prospect of a penniless future, and his proud refusal to allow his personal difficulties to be met by public aid, all are illuminated here.

8. III, 196-197. The project is mentioned enigmatically in *Corr.*, VIII, 185.

9. Much work will have to be done here to sort out and rectify the account given by Georges Normandy in his commentary accompanying the letters to Raoul-Duval. He provides a convincing and consistent story, but this new publication will permit checking on some of the data (Normandy is careless about indicating fully his sources for quoted material). Thus, on p. 178 he ascribes to Laporte and also transcribes erroneously material from two letters written by Flaubert to Laporte. The correct transcriptions are to be found in *Supplément*, III, 311 and 334. This reversal of writer and recipient also, of course, reverses their roles. All of Normandy's work will have to be verified in this fashion. It is not easy to imagine what useful purpose he thought he was serving by such alterations of the facts.

Toward the end of 1877 the catastrophe took a sharp turn for the worse when Laporte's personal fortune was seriously reduced. He had contributed large sums to help Flaubert and had guaranteed notes; now he was no longer in a position to continue his aid and Flaubert's last hope of salvation began slowly to wane (IV, 54). The new letters add to the details but do not materially alter what was already known or guessed. Edmond de Goncourt and Taine attempted to get him a post early in 1879, but he refused at first on the same grounds as earlier: the salary was too low to compensate for the expenses involved in living in Paris (IV, 146-147). It would seem that later he gave in and was then rejected (IV, 176). The letters from 1879, more poignant even than those already published, show the humiliations and anguish of the tired man: "Quelle torture! mon Dieu! quelle torture!" he could well write.¹⁰ And he found himself unable any longer to refuse a pension, hoping only that it could remain a secret: "Soyez le gardien de ce que je considère (à tort ou à raison) comme mon Honneur, ma seule richesse," he wrote to Maupassant (IV, 189). When it became apparent that his post had to be known to the public, he wrote in nobly humble terms: "De tout ce que j'avais, je n'ai rien gardé que l'orgueil. Qu'on ne me l'enlève pas! Je ne pourrais plus écrire" (IV, 220). It has been said that this attitude shows the fundamentally bourgeois character of this violent enemy of the bourgeoisie; the observation seems insulting in the face of these simply written lines. One week before, he had spent his last franc (IV, 215).

The magnanimous role of Laporte, maligned by Flaubert's niece, is at last clear. In a long footnote (IV, 266-267), the editors summarize earlier studies which give the full account of his long patience and his growing awareness of the dishonest practices of Commanville. They publish letters showing Laporte's tactful efforts to enlighten Flaubert and what appears to be Flaubert's last letter to him, containing near the end the hope which was not to be fulfilled: "Enfin, quoi que vous décidiez, mon bon, rien ne sera changé entre nous deux. . ." (IV, 268). His niece and her husband carefully arranged the rupture between Flaubert and this man who by then knew too much of Commanville's unsavory financial practices. But Flaubert's calvary was not yet over: shortly he was to realize that there were more disasters in store than he had imagined even in his worst fears. In a letter of March 30, 1880, his bewilderment was total and he was forced to admit that he was entirely dependent for information on what his niece cared to tell him (IV, 323-325).

As the blows fell ever more heavily he came to repeat with increasing frequency: "il est temps que ça finisse; sinon, je finirai moi-même" (IV, 329). Two weeks later he died: after the years of anguish which he had lived through, if he had a moment of consciousness in which he knew that the end was near, he must have welcomed that end with a sigh of relief.

10. IV, 187. The whole letter should be read.

The new letters present far more fully than before the noble and tragic end of this lovable man: all the host of readers of the earlier letters will be grateful for this publication. In the presence of such a feast, it seems almost out of place to presume to cavil at the manner of serving or to object, when so much is offered, that some things have been left out. The editors state in the Introduction (I, viii) that certain unimportant notes have been omitted; given the relative lack of interest of some of those published, it is certain that nothing important has been withheld on these grounds. Unfortunately, other considerations (lack of money, or typographical problems?) led them not to publish one vast body of material which students of Flaubert would indeed wish to have available. It has long been known that the earlier Conard edition was subjected to the most careful editing to remove all references to a number of topics deemed objectionable: his affair with his niece's governess and his syphilis are examples in point. The editors of the new volumes have found themselves forced to forego the publication of this excised material: all *flaubertistes* must regret this decision.¹¹ Further regret is occasioned by the Index. It is a comprehensive tally of the people mentioned in the letters, each entry carrying a succinct account of the person; unfortunately, that is all. Someone with a devotion to Flaubert will now have to address himself to the task of preparing an index to the contents of these volumes, corresponding to the one now accompanying the original nine volumes. It is too bad that this could not have been done in conjunction with the preparation of the present Index.

The publication over the last ten years of the letters to Turgenev, to Raoul-Duval, and to Du Camp¹² causes more serious problems. A series of decisions by the present editors leaves these earlier volumes as necessary as ever, despite the reprinting of most of their material here. For his careful edition of Flaubert's letters to Turgenev, Gérard-Gailly had been able to consult the autographs and hence to determine a number of mistaken readings in those already published in the Conard edition of 1926-33. The editors of the *Supplément* are consistent in their decision not to include corrections of letters in the earlier Conard edition; hence scholars will continue to need Gérard-Gailly's work for his corrections of the letters to Turgenev (e.g., letter No. 2 on pp. 5-6 of his book). As a matter of fact, both publications are needed, for the new editors have been able to correct some of the conclusions of Gérard-Gailly (e.g., I, 37, n. 2) and have added some

11. The deleted fragment of the letter in which he named his illness has been reproduced by Mme Durry, op. cit., pp. 403-404. The affair with Juliet Herbert is mentioned in Jean Pommier and Claude Digeon, "Du nouveau sur Flaubert et son œuvre," *Mercure de France*, 1065 (1^{er} mai 1952), 53.

Other omissions, or the use of initial letters only, stem from the familiar problem of the crudity of some of Flaubert's language and topics. The editors vary in their treatment of *foutre*, but consistently reduce *emmerder* to its initial letter. Sometimes this sort of editing is not only irritating but futile: e.g., the suppression of a passage (I, 64) which had already been published *in extenso* by Auriant, op. cit., p. 30.

12. See n. 4.

new letters (e.g., II, 218-220). It seems somehow unnecessary and rather unfortunate. The letters to Du Camp and others published by Auriant present the same problems. The present editors have corrected errors in reading made by Auriant (e.g., I, 60-61), but there are deletions in the *Supplément* in the interests of decency (e.g., I, 64) and places where the editors refer to the Conard *Correspondance* when it would have been more useful to refer to the corrected version given by Auriant (e.g., I, 142, where the reference is to *Corr.*, II, No. 290, which is corrected in several dozen places by Auriant). Moreover, Auriant gives much additional information to situate his letters, more than could readily be supplied within the space limitations of the present edition.¹³ But the new edition must be used in conjunction with Auriant's publication, not only for its corrections of readings, but also because it adds dates to several letters and rearranges the order of others.¹⁴ The letters to Raoul-Duval offer the same sorts of difficulties, and here, too, the new edition does not make it possible to do without the older one.¹⁵ There still remains much to be done on Flaubert's correspondence, despite this magnificent new offering of letters.

University of Michigan

13. Contrast II, 23, with Auriant, pp. 74-79, to which a footnote in the *Supplément* refers the reader.

14. A minor detail in Auriant is rectified by the new publication. On p. 9 he indicated that Flaubert had burned all of Du Camp's letters except nineteen which, said Auriant, he kept for reasons of sentiment and to use as documents. Auriant states that this took place long before 1869, but gives no indication that he is in fact paraphrasing a letter of Flaubert's which he reproduces on p. 49, with the probable date as 1869. The letter is given in III, 319, and dated 1877, a correction of an earlier date proposed by Gérard-Gailly. The actual burning, thus, took place in 1877.

15. See 9.

REVIEW ARTICLE

APOLLINAIRE SINCE 1950

By LeRoy C. Breunig

THE publication of *The Selected Writings of Apollinaire* in 1950 brought forth an unusually enthusiastic essay in the *London Times Literary Supplement* (September 22, 1950). "It will hardly be contested," wrote the reviewer, "that France has produced five major poets in the past hundred years—Baudelaire, Rimbaud, Mallarmé, Valéry and Apollinaire—and this may be said without prejudice to other pretenders such as Verlaine, Eluard or Claudel." This English appraisal, coming shortly after the sympathetic studies of Cecily Mackworth¹ and C. M. Bowra,² elevated Apollinaire to a position in modern literature which few critics on the other side of the Channel, outside of the poet's own coterie, would have dared to grant him before 1950. It is true that immediately after World War II he had enjoyed a definite revival, but, for the most part, it was as "Guillaume," the personal friend of Louise Faure-Favier,³ André Rouveyre,⁴ and André Billy,⁵ or as the author of poems and letters to "Lou," published for the first time in 1947.⁶ With few exceptions Apollinarian criticism in France during this period tended toward the personal and journalistic.

Since 1950, however, Apollinaire has steadily been assuming the rank of a "classic" and commanding attention from those beyond his own orbit of traditional admirers. This current is perhaps nowhere more dramatically evident than in one of the several revisions which Gaëtan Picon made between the 1949 and 1951 editions of his *Panorama de la nouvelle littérature française*. The earlier edition concludes a cursory glance at the Apollinaire group before World War I by stressing how distant their poetry seems today. "Et c'est surtout par ce climat de fantaisie, de vacances sans arrière-pensée, qu'elle nous semble un peu étrangère" (p. 30). In 1951, however, we find a new section inserted. It begins: "N'ayons garde d'oublier cependant, que ce moment de la littérature contemporaine est l'un des plus riches qui soient" (p. 34). And there follows a laudatory reappraisal of Apollinaire, "l'un des poètes les plus riches, les plus ingénieux et les plus émouvants de toute notre poésie" (pp. 35-36).

In early 1954 Apollinaire officially entered the University—in a lecture series offered at the Sorbonne by Mme Marie-Jeanne Dury. At approxi-

1. "Je suis Guillaume Apollinaire," *Horizon*, XI, pp. 90-98.

2. "Order and adventure in Guillaume Apollinaire." In *The Creative Experiment* (London, 1949), pp. 61-93.

3. *Souvenirs sur Guillaume Apollinaire* (Paris: Grasset, 1945).

4. *Apollinaire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1945).

5. *Guillaume Apollinaire* (Paris: Seghers, 1947).

6. *Ombre de mon amour* (Geneva: Cailler, 1947).

mately the same time two of his poems, "L'Emigrant de Landor Road" and "Le Pont Mirabeau," appeared with appropriate *explications de texte* for class-room use,⁷ and *Alcools* as a whole served as the basis for the first of a series of word frequency studies on the vocabulary of symbolism which Pierre Guiraud, professor at the University of Groningen, is currently preparing.⁸ This does not mean that Apollinaire has lost any of his vitality outside of the University, and one of the noteworthy features of *Le Flâneur des deux rives*, the new quarterly "Bulletin d'études apollinariennes," which began to appear in March of 1954, is the balance which its editor, Marcel Adéma, seems to maintain between "textes" by fellow poets and "études" by scholars. Along with brief reminiscences or appreciations by André Breton, Jean Cocteau and Pierre MacOrlan one finds meticulous studies by Mario Roques, René Louis of the University of Caen and Michel Décaudin of the University of Lille.

Since 1950 there have also appeared, in addition to a new crop of hitherto unpublished letters and manuscripts,⁹ four separate volumes devoted to Apollinaire. Each one contributes in varying degree to the filling in of his portrait, but none can perhaps be considered as the definitive work. The biography by Marcel Adéma is by far the most complete study yet written.¹⁰ One has only to compare it with the legends and lacunae of the 1943 *Guillaume Apollinaire* of Aegerter and Labracherie to appreciate how much has been uncovered by the research of the last decade. M. Adéma gives a sober, solid account. His first chapter begins in the traditional manner: "Guillaume Apollinaire naquit à Rome le 26 août 1880" (p. 1), and he proceeds in the most faithfully chronological order to the death and burial in 1918. There is no claim to portray the epoch, to analyze Apollinaire's poetic art or to evaluate his talent and influence. Within the strict limits of biography the author has admirably fulfilled his aim. Moreover he has included many new documents of which the most valuable are excerpts of letters to or from Rousseau, Delaunay, Marie Laurencin and Breton together with bits of art criticism such as the preface to the catalogue of Braque's 1908 exhibit and a cubist manifesto in the *Section d'or* of 1912. An exhaustive, thirty-two page bibliography completes the work.

Despite these riches M. Adéma's study does not entirely satisfy either the layman or the specialist. The very natural desire to elaborate upon the valuable data which he himself unearthed, such as the details of Apollinaire's paternal ancestry, of his hand-to-mouth existence upon arriving in

7. Jacques Vier: "Explication française, Guillaume Apollinaire, 'L'Emigrant de Landor Road,'" *L'Ecole*, 30 mai, 1953, and the commentary on "Le Pont Mirabeau" in Castex et Surer, *Manuel des études littéraires françaises*, VI, XXe siècle (Paris: Hachette, 1954), pp. 28-30.

8. *Index du vocabulaire du Symbolisme: 1, Index des mots d'Alcools de Guillaume Apollinaire* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1953).

9. *Tendre comme le souvenir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952); *Casanova, comédie parodique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952); *Le Guetteur mélancolique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952).

10. Marcel Adéma: *Guillaume Apollinaire le mal-aimé* (Paris: Plon, 1952). Pp. 293.

Paris, or of his brief love for Linda Molina da Silva, gives a slight distortion to an otherwise well balanced biography. Similarly the poems he cites, precisely because they are *inédits* for the most part, hardly provide a representative sampling, and an uninitiated reader might well wonder as to the poet's real worth. At the same time, and undoubtedly in the interest of brevity or readability, M. Adéma occasionally omits data with which he apparently disagrees. He writes, for example, that Apollinaire met Picasso on a summer day in 1904 at the Criterion Bar near the Gare St.-Lazare. This is stated as a fact, and it probably is, but there has been so much conflicting testimony on this one meeting that the biographer should let us know whose particular version this is and how he came to adopt it. Such omissions are rare, however, and as a compilation of facts this biography is certainly as reliable as any that we may expect.

The very modest title of Jeanine Moulin's study¹¹ is deceptive, for her introduction is the first extensive and systematic attempt in French to analyze Apollinaire's poetic art.¹² Taking the quarrel between "Order" and "Adventure" of "La Jolie Rousse" as her theme, she examines Apollinaire in turn as a poet of tradition and as an experimenter. She realizes fully that such a neat division can only be provisional for handling the multiple complexities of each poem, and she admits in her conclusion that one cannot really dissociate the two elements. In spite of her own cautious disclaimer, however, this method allows her to make a lucid exposition of the principal themes and techniques as well as the formative influences.

Mlle Moulin's own sympathies are quite obviously with the traditionalist, and this causes her to underrate, perhaps, the validity and depth of Apollinaire's modernism. Throughout the second part of the essay runs the implication that modernism was something imposed upon him from without and that he was almost a victim of three main forces acting upon him: Rimbaud, futurism and cubism. Although she does not go so far as to say that without them Apollinaire would have been a better poet, the tenor of her analysis is inclined to be negative. She states, for example, that he espoused cubism tardily and somewhat diffidently. Actually the preface to the catalogue of Braque's 1908 exhibit, published, of course, too late for her to be cognizant of it, would seem to indicate that he was sympathetic to the movement from the outset.

This anti-modernist prejudice occasionally causes Mlle Moulin to neglect some very persuasive evidence. She maintains that Apollinaire became an occult poet, "un prospecteur de l'inconnu," under the direct inspiration of Rimbaud in 1908 and that this influence produced only the most artificial imitations. She bases her opinion almost exclusively upon two single works,

11. Guillaume Apollinaire: *Textes inédits, avec une introduction de Jeanine Moulin* (Genève: Droz, 1952). Pp. 194.

12. The only comparable effort is Mr. Roger Shattuck's excellent analysis of the construction, imagery and themes of Apollinaire's verse in the Introduction to *The Selected Writings of Apollinaire*.

"Onirocritique" and "Les Fiançailles," which first appeared in 1908. Admittedly "Onirocritique" lacks the depth and sincerity of *Les Illuminations*, but Mlle Moulin seems unduly harsh in her condemnation of "Les Fiançailles," and, what is more important, she forgets "Le Brasier," which was published the same year. Anyone who has read the commentary on this poem by Robert Champigny¹³ must definitely recognize it as one of the masterpieces in the genre which Mlle Moulin appropriately calls "la poésie irréaliste." There is also "Cortège," which she cites, it is true, but only later in order to illustrate her contention that Apollinaire did not become a poet-prophet until 1912, after he had read Rimbaud's letter to Demyen, first published in October of that year in the *Nouvelle Revue Française*. The reluctance of Mlle Moulin to grant Apollinaire any originality seems particularly unjustified here since "Cortège" was published in November of 1912, and it seems most unlikely that he would have read and digested the "lettre du voyant" and composed and published his own poem in the space of one month, especially since the manuscript bears evidence that he may have written it as early as 1906. Dates of publication are not necessarily dates of composition, and in any case the influence of Rimbaud upon *Alcools* and *Calligrammes* was less mechanical and considerably more fruitful than this study implies.

In 1954 Apollinaire was added to the "Ecrivains de toujours" collection in an attractive little volume prepared by Pascal Pia.¹⁴ This is primarily a biography interspersed with fragments of poems and prose and rich in iconography. A detailed, fifteen-page chronology and a selected bibliography lend the volume considerable value as a reference work. M. Pia does not pretend to introduce any original material. His narrative is a well written digest of M. Adéma's work, with the usual stress on the five love affairs, the Mona Lisa case, Guillaume as a soldier and other more or less popular episodes of his life. To these the author has added random chapters on such controversial points as the identity of Tristouse Ballerinet, the date of composition of *Les Mamelles de Tirésias*, or the sincerity of Apollinaire's religious sentiment. Although the judgments are sound, these digressions, without being complete, are long enough to detract from the unity of the book as an introduction, despite M. Pia's sprightly style and sure poetic sense. For him a single piece such as "La Chanson du mal-aimé" outweighs all of the poet's theoretical and critical writing. Unfortunately this attitude blinds him to Apollinaire's role in modern art. If M. Pia had replaced his chapter on Tristouse Ballerinet by one on the "bateau-lavoir" his volume would be somewhat more solid.

Also in 1954 Tristan Tzara published a new edition of *Alcools*¹⁵ intended

13. "Le temps chez Apollinaire," *PMLA*, LXVII, no. 2, pp. 3-14.

14. *Apollinaire par lui-même: Images et textes présentés par Pascal Pia* (Paris: Aux éditions du Seuil, 1954). Pp. 192.

15. Guillaume Apollinaire: *Alcools*, suivi de reproductions inédites des premières épreuves corrigées de la main d'Apollinaire commentées et annotées par Tristan Tzara. (Paris: Le Club du meilleur livre, 1954). Pp. 169.

to correct the many typographical errors of both the *Mercure de France* and the later Gallimard editions. An appendix contains reproductions of several pages of the original set of corrected proofs together with explanatory notes. Despite its handsome format the volume is a great disappointment. New errors have been substituted for old to such an extent that the publishers have been obliged to issue a supplementary brochure of *errata*, entitled euphemistically "Nouvelles observations à propos d'*Alcools*." The errors and omissions result not only from careless proofreading but from incomplete research in the preparation of the text. When *Alcools* was published in 1913 the majority of the poems had already appeared in various periodicals, and one of the first steps in establishing a definitive text would obviously have been to consult these versions, to say nothing of the available manuscripts in the Jacques Doucet collection. Admittedly there are numerous variants between the first and final drafts which need not have concerned M. Tzara, but there are also outright errors in all editions of *Alcools*, including his, which the first versions would have clarified. The "Poème lu au mariage d'André Salmon," for example, has the following meaningless line, referring to Ophelia:

Qui blanche flotte encore les nénuphars.

A glance at the poem as it appeared in *Vers et Prose* (XXVII, 1911) clears up the problem immediately:

Qui blanche flotte encore entre les nénuphars.

Similarly a study of the original MS of "Rhénane d'automne" with its lines on the dead in the cemetery:

La vie leur pourrit dans la panse
La croix leur pousse entre les pieds

would have made it clear that in the *Alcools* version, where the poet shifts to the second person

La vie vous pourrit dans la panse
La croix nous pousse entre les pieds

the "nous" of the second line is an obvious misreading for "vous." The far reaching consequences of such an error become apparent when one reads in the translation, "Rhenish Autumn," which recently appeared in *Wake* 12 (p. 114):

Life is rotting your belly
We stumble on the cross at our feet.

It is only in the "Nouvelles observations à propos d'*Alcools*" that M. Tzara corrects this and other *errata*.

It is also unfortunate that M. Tzara has not published the complete set of corrected proofs in the appendix. The several plates containing frag-

ments of only ten poems serve merely to tantalize the student of Apollinaire and prevent him from forming any independent interpretations.

In an introductory essay M. Tzara makes an eloquent defense of *Alcools* as one of the masterpieces of twentieth-century poetry. Unfortunately he feels obliged to draw a sharp contrast between *Les Fleurs du mal* as poetry of abnegation and despair and *Alcools* as poetry of hope and affirmation. This defense by attack seems not only a little too pat but unnecessarily bellicose. If the London *Times* appraisal is just and if Apollinaire's position as one of the major French poets is secure, it does not seem necessary to vaunt one of them at the expense of another. In the company of great artists the struggle for highest or lowest is, as Kierkegaard points out, "just as childish as a struggle for first place at Confirmation before the altar." The years since 1950 have definitely established a solid rank for Apollinaire. One need no longer be aggressive about him, and there is still much for serious scholars to investigate.

Barnard College

REVIEWS

The Medieval French Drama. By Grace Frank. Oxford University Press, 1954. Pp. viii + 296.

This carefully written and handsomely printed treatise is a welcome addition to the Oxford medieval series. Nobody could be better qualified to undertake this task than Mrs. Frank. During her many years as professor of Old French at Bryn Mawr her publications have ranged over a wide field but have centered in an acute and penetrating exposition of the drama, of which her editions in *CFMA* and *SATF* are outstanding examples. This book is a fitting climax to a notable career.

It comprises twenty-five chapters, followed by an authors' List of Books and an Index. Starting with the premise that "Western Europe in the Middle Ages re-created its drama not from the dead debris of the extinct classical theatre but from its own living faith," it deals with such topics as: Liturgical Easter Plays (Ch. II), The Fleury Play-Book (IV), Production of the Liturgical Drama (VII), *Le Mystère d'Adam* (VIII), The Beginnings of the Miracle Play: *Le Jeu de S. Nicolas* (X), Rutebeuf (XI), Development of the Passion Play (XIII), Staging and Organization (XVI), Late Passion Plays—Greban, Michel (XVII), The Beginnings of Comedy (XX), The Plays of Adam le Bossu: *Jeu de la Feuillée*, *Robin et Marion* (XXII), Comedy in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: *Pathelin* (XXIV)—and interlarded is *Aucassin et Nicolette* thus recalling Roques' proposal that this *chantefable* is a form of *mime*—"imitation de la réalité par le geste et par la voix, sans recours aux procédés d'une mise en scène complète et régulière."

In all of this Mrs. Frank attempts nothing markedly new. She is scrupulous in giving credit to her predecessors: Petit de Julleville, Creizenach, Roy, Chambers, Cohen, and Karl Young. But, and this is her greatest asset, she brings her subject up to date (often to a detail) and she leaves her reader something permanent to build on. In fact, considering how extensive the field is, her 272 pages are a model of the art of compression. Had she, however, seen fit to divide her treatise into Parts, Part I might have been entitled: The Liturgical Play (*Mystère*), Part II, The Play of Transition (*Miracle*), Part III, the Comic Play (*jeu, farce, sottie*), with a possible Part IV, The *Confrérie de la Passion* (so important for the transition to the seventeenth century). This might have made the development of her theme stand out more clearly. Incidentally, inasmuch as the book is "designed for both students and the general reader," I regret that it does not include the famous vignette of the Valenciennes *Passion* of 1547, painted by Robert Cailleau, which would have placed before the reader's eyes a medieval setting—accessible as this design is from other books.

In referring now to the high points in her treatment, which is a matter

of choice or personal opinion, the St. Gall trope from which the Liturgical Play sprang is excellently set forth on p. 21:

It seems possible indeed that the author of the *Quem quaeritis* was the Tutilo of St. Gall who lived in the second half of the ninth century and was closely associated with Notker Balbulus. Here, made vivid, was the conversation between the angels and the Marys at the tomb of Christ, and although sources for the dialogue were at hand in the Vulgate and the liturgy . . . this trope must be considered an original creation.

While attached to the Mass the trope remained a lyrical embellishment of the service and nothing more. . . . Some time during the tenth century, however, the trope was transferred to the end of the early morning service of Matins where it was interpolated between the conclusion of the third responsory and the final *Te Deum*, and in this new position the *Quem quaeritis* became truly dramatic: its dialogue was sung by half-choirs, by cantors, or by cantors and choir, who impersonated the characters of the Marys and the angels; they played their roles with appropriate gestures and voice-changes in a setting that thereby became for the audience a suitable *mise en scène*.

So, pp. 44 ff., The Fleury Play-Book, reveal sophistication at work in devising new scenes and wholly new plays besides describing the Latin plays (finely edited by Albrecht in 1935) concerned with St. Nicholas. Fleury was near Orléans—a poetic center before 1200—from which Mrs. Frank passes readily to the Beauvais *Daniel* and the *Sponsus* (a dramatization of the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins), a product of the Benedictine abbey of Limoges and partly in the vernacular, a language on the borderline between French and Provençal.

The desire to make religion visible, reflected in the use of the vernacular (already found in the plays of Hilarius) and in the introduction of realism, appears the moment performances were held outside the church doors. This brings us to the first surviving French play, *Le Mystère d'Adam*, on which Mrs. Frank 'opens up' and writes one of her most vivid chapters. Dated at the close of the twelfth century, the text is Anglo-Norman and, in its elaborate stage directions (in Latin), shows the poet's professional concern for diction, *mise en scène*, and costume. Incomplete as it is, but divided into three parts (Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, a prophet-play on the coming of Christ), the originality of the characterizations and the sprightliness of the dialogue make it one of the masterpieces of the Middle Ages. To quote Mrs. Frank (p. 77):

Particularly adroit is the scene in which Satan tempts Eve, coaxing and flattering her, appealing to her pride, vanity, and ambition. . . . He begins to arouse her curiosity: he will tell her a wonderful secret, if she will promise not to reveal it. . . . Then he proceeds to contrast her wisdom and exquisite tenderness with Adam's stupidity and obstinacy. . . . 'He will soon be soft,' says the Devil, 'and as for his pride, why, Adam is nothing but a slave. . . . You at least must look out for

your own future. You're a dainty, weak little thing (*fioble e tendre chose*)—whiter than a snow-flake, more delicate than a rose.'

God has deceived her: 'The fruits of the garden that you are permitted to eat have no virtue; only the one He has forbidden can make you strong and give you power; in it is the grace of life and the knowledge of Good and Evil.'

Eve asks what this fruit tastes like: 'Ah,' says Satan, 'it has a celestial flavour,' and if she will only eat of it she will be queen of the whole world, of heaven and hell, master of all knowledge; in short . . . she will . . . occupy a position befitting her lovely face and figure.

The second and third parts, thinks Mrs. Frank, "while . . . less subtle and entertaining than the first," nevertheless show an artist capable of recreating and visualizing for himself, and she goes to some pains to bring out the author's concern for the proper acting of the play (p. 82):

Not only are the costumes and movements of the actors described, but even their facial expressions and manner of speaking. Paradise . . . is to be placed in a conspicuous, or higher, position; it is to be surrounded with silken hangings disposed in such a way that people within may be seen from the shoulders up. . . . God is to wear a dalmatic, Adam a red tunic, and Eve vestments of white silk. Adam is to stand near God, his countenance serious and composed; Eve is to look a little humbler.

There follow the directions so often likened to Hamlet's words to the players: Adam is to be well taught when to reply, and in this he should be neither too quick nor too slow. And, not only he, but all other persons, should be properly instructed.

It is clear then that in the staging of the *Mystère*, as in its composition, this unknown author is unique.

He knew liturgical texts and performances, but in departing from them he . . . used the same skill and creative imagination that pervade his lively, realistic dialogues, his clever characterizations, and his facile verse forms!

Arras in the North had a literary fame equal to that of Orléans and Limoges. It produced two dramatists of note: Jean Bodel and Adam le Bossu or de la Halle, who together with Rutebeuf loom large in Old French literature. Rutebeuf's *Miracle de Théophile* is an early version of the Faust story, but in motivation and technique it does not rank with Bodel's *Jeu de S. Nicolas* or Adam's *Jeu de la Feuillée* and *Robin et Marion*. On these last three compositions Mrs. Frank again is at her best—especially gripping is her short account (p. 97) of Bodel's life and her analysis of his ever-popular version of the St. Nicholas legend. In the same manner she catches the originality and charm of Adam le Bossu's fanciful comedies, particularly the quite Shakespearean *Jeu de la Feuillée*.

But, if "among the farces there can be but one choice,"—namely, *Pathelin*—so actable even today, her pages on it (253-259) must be read in full to be appreciated.

It must be obvious that, in making any critical comments on so notable an achievement, I am expressing a purely personal view. As indicated above, the arrangement of the book is not wholly felicitous. It ends with 'comedy,' whereas chronologically with the decline of the 'epic' in the Middle French period and the growing importance of the bourgeois class it is the theme of the Passion that finally dominates the stage:

la Passion

Ke Dex soufri o grant ahan

Por le pechié ke fist Adan.

The later *mystères* are of inordinate length, that by the brothers Greban having some sixty-two thousand lines. It is but natural that, with the tendency to be encyclopedic, the authors should vary the tone of composition to suit the situations treated: not only do realistic details abound but the serious dialogue, rich in moralizing quips, is often interrupted by comic relief—hence the farce. When we realize the kinship of this type of drama to the decorative arts (painting, tapestry, etc.) we see how well it epitomizes the life of the age. After all, French tragi-comedy from which Classical tragedy came had a broad medieval basis (Frank, p. 270; cf. Lancaster, *Mémoire de Mahelot*, p. 34).

Mrs. Frank is so cognizant of the international character (Latin-French) of the medieval drama that one may regret that her concision did not allow her to stress more the social and historical aspects of her subject.

So, too, an admirable beginning is made of the use and explanation of dramatic terms, *jeu, ludus, feste, mistere, miracle, mansions* (*journée* is not in the Index), etc., in Ch. XVI; but a reference-list of these terms might have been added to the volume, making it unnecessary, e.g., to ferret through the references (p. 245, note 4) for the meaning of *farce* and its derivation, so important for the evolution of a genre.

Mrs. Frank does not include translations. Yet, she will admit that "the general reader" might profit by Holbrook's *Farce of Master Pierre Patelin*, 1905 (first edition), Jeanroy's *Théâtre religieux en France du XI^e au XIII^e siècles* (which includes the *Jeu d'Adam*), 1924, and Langlois' *Adam le Bossu: Le Jeu de la Feuillée et Le Jeu de Robin et Marion*, 1923.

All in all, one lays down this book with the conviction of having read a fascinating treatise presented by a master in a thorough-going and engaging way.

WILLIAM A. NITZE

Los Angeles, California

A History of Italian Literature. By Ernest Hatch Wilkins. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954. Pp. 523.

All persons in the English-speaking world who are interested directly or indirectly in Italian literature, whether students, teachers, scholars or general readers aware of the resurgent vitality of post-war Italy, should

rejoice in the publication of this volume. Here at last is a history which is modern in conception, comprehensive yet relatively short, authoritative yet extremely readable. Although introductory in purpose and in fact, its high professional qualities will tempt the specialist to be unfairly critical by making him forget that it was written especially for American and English readers, "whether or not they have any knowledge of the Italian language or any previous interest in the literature of Italy" (p. v).

The need for such a volume has long been felt and has grown more acute as the decline in language study and the growth of "general education" have lent impetus and respectability to the use of translations. Even in the days when persons seeking to learn about Italian literature felt an obligation to learn the language first, their needs were not well served by existing Italian literary histories. Doubtless through professional pride, most Italian critics who try their hand at literary history find it beneath their dignity to impart any sort of elementary information. The exceptions produce works which, to a mature reader, seem arid and schoolboyish. The majority write as if for their peers or, at the very lowest, for readers who possess the wealth of information acquired in the classical *liceo* and have at least a basic familiarity with the works discussed. Anyone who has made his first approach to the subject through the translation of De Sanctis' history (Harcourt, Brace, 1931) will, I am sure, agree that translations of such works provide no solution. The grandiloquent failure that was J. S. Kenard's *A Literary History of the Italian People* (Macmillan, 1941) testified again to the need and the difficulty of filling it. More recently Professor Robert A. Hall made a valiant and respectable effort in his *Short History of Italian Literature* (Linguistica, 1951), but his work follows too closely the pattern of its Italian models in including too many authors and too much detail.

Much of the special value of Professor Wilkins' history lies in the bold and resolute manner in which he has shaped his vision of Italian literature to the needs and interests of his public. There can be no denying that in so doing he will, in one place or another, have incurred the wrath of his specialist colleagues; but let us face it as he has faced it: Outside of the *Divine Comedy* and the contemporary novel the principal function of Italian literature in this country today is ancillary. So we should not be surprised to find that only one of the masterpieces, the *Divine Comedy*, has been granted the customary separate chapter. Nearly all of the secondary authors included in the text receive very brief treatment which, thanks to Professor Wilkins' economy of expression, manages to seem quite adequate. Dozens of minor authors are simply not there; they will be found, with dates and field of activity, in "A List of Additional Writers" (pp. 499-500). Some are familiar figures and will be missed: Aligarotti, Lodovico Dolce, Firenzuola, Fracastoro, Varchi; missed by scholars, yes, but not by the readers for whom the volume was designed.

I suppose the same criterion was responsible for reducing the treatment

of the last hundred years to about 60 pages. Yet the current interest in contemporary Italian writers would seem to have made a fuller treatment, not only of our century but of the "secondo Ottocento," more in keeping with the principles governing the selection. To relegate to the "List" such figures as Carlo Levi, Sem Benelli (*The Jest*), Panzini and Silone (and to omit completely poor Marco Praga) seems to me to ignore the prevalent trend toward the modern—which we may deplore but which we cannot deny. Of course, it may be that, in making this criticism, I am falling into the same error against which I warned my colleagues above, for there can be no doubt that it is this sort of ruthless pruning which makes the forest of Italian literature visible in this book.

Professor Wilkins has contributed to this clarity also by the basic organization of his material, or what he terms "periodization." In doing so he has departed radically from the traditional organization by centuries, genres or epochs. He alludes to this briefly in the Introduction (p. vi) and again in the second item in the Appendix, "A List of Literary Periods," where he supplies approximate dates for each period and the chapters in which it is treated. A full and closely reasoned statement of his position has already appeared in a recent issue of this journal (February, 1954). There he discusses the false impressions and confusions resulting from division by centuries and, after examining various alternatives, states the general principle which his history employs: "Most . . . periods . . . may well be named from writers dominant or outstanding in their several periods" (p. 10). Thus what is traditionally (and misleadingly) known as "The Sicilian School" appears in his history as "Frederick the Second and his Circle." Likewise, what is often treated as "The Sixteenth Century" is broken down into 12 chapters beginning with "Bembo" and ending with "The Drama in the Late Sixteenth Century." From this last it may be seen that Professor Wilkins' position is not dogmatic but realistic; where common sense and convenience are better served by the conventional use of genre or century or both, he follows convention. Including the excellent first chapter, "Early Folk Literature and Minstrelsy," there are 16 similar exceptions; the rest of the 52 chapters derive their titles from an outstanding author.

There may be those among the specialists who will raise objections, if not to the principle, at least to its application, though the principle would seem safe enough among scholars already familiar with theories of *générations littéraires*. Even in Italian literature Professor Wilkins' chosen path is less unbeaten than he realized, for it has already been taken in large part by the late Attilio Momigliano. In his *Storia della letteratura italiana* (1937), clearest and best of the shorter Italian histories that I know, two-thirds of the 25 chapters derive their titles from the dominant author. The remaining one-third contain about the same proportion and type of century-reference used by Professor Wilkins but there is a greater tendency toward the use

of "isms." Readers who regret the absence from Professor Wilkins' chapter-headings of such familiar terms as *marinismo*, *secentismo*, baroque, romanticism and *verismo*, will find a number of such subject entries in the Index; a few more would have increased the book's usefulness as a reference work. The non-specialist who is looking for the meaning of the traditional "Sicilian School" might have been spared time and frustration by this means, as might also the reader who fails to associate *secentismo* with *marinismo*. Pursuit of some references may yield disconcerting results: I, for example, am attached, sentimentally and perhaps unreasonably, to the *dolce stil nuovo* and I must confess to a surge of indignation at finding it reduced to a footnote.

One of the features contributing to the enjoyment and value of the history is the way in which its subject-matter is constantly linked with developments in other cultural elements and in the realm of politics. This is not limited to the Italian peninsula alone; a distinct effort is made to associate happenings in Italy with conditions on the continent and especially in England. Thus in introducing his discussion of Tasso, Professor Wilkins refers briefly to Spanish exploitation and the continuing struggle with the Turks; to the compositions of Palestrina, the philosophy of Telesio and the visit of Montaigne; and concludes with a paragraph on Italian influence in the reign of Elizabeth I. The economy and restraint with which this is done are as important as the doing, for the reader is never distracted from the principal subject.

If literature should not be studied historically in a vacuum, neither should it be discussed critically without sampling. In addition to supplying excellent résumés, Professor Wilkins makes the work discussed come alive by providing sizable excerpts, well chosen to give the flavor of the whole. Ten stanzas of St. Francis's *Laudes*, three of Guinizelli's *Al cor gentil*; a sonnet, almost half a *canzone* and a section of the prose of the *Vita nova*; an entire sonnet of Michelangelo and portions of six others, and similarly with other authors. In some instances, standard translators such as Rossetti or Symonds are quoted, but for the most part Professor Wilkins has provided his own versions and they are very good, whether in verse or in prose.

In his discussions we find a combination of fine critical sensitivity with an extraordinary direct acquaintance with his vast material and scholarship that is accurate, profound and up-to-date.¹ In general he presents the standard modern point of view. If doubt or controversy exists, he points it out; in the few cases where he feels compelled to express a minority opinion (the origin of the *strambotto*, for example), he acknowledges it as such. One feels everywhere the operation of an informed, serene judgment, alert, original yet always aware of the responsibility to avoid misleading the reader by yielding to a personal slant.

1. The only error I have found is on page 487 where *Il Mulino del Po* is referred to as "Il Mulino sul Po."

Of individual chapters, that on the *Divine Comedy* is by all odds the most outstanding. Beginning with the letter to Can Grande, it briefly describes the form of the poem and provides a clear explanation of Dante's sense of mission. The analysis of the three *cantiche* which follows is truly remarkable for its combination of concise and vivid narration with critical insights of great originality and effectiveness. It is, in its own way, almost as much a masterpiece as the *Comedy* itself. The chapter on Petrarch is excellent in everything but its treatment of the *Canzoniere*. The same reservation would apply to the chapter on Boccaccio which allots only two of its eleven pages to the *Decameron*. My concern here is definitely for the novice who may actually be misled since quantitative judgments are implicit in all such histories. The sections on Machiavelli and Guicciardini, Tasso, Campanella, Vico, Alfieri and Leopardi seem to me to rise above the generally excellent level, as does the particularly fine chapter on Lorenzo de' Medici. In this instance Professor Wilkins departs happily from tradition in the degree of importance he attaches to Lorenzo as compared with Politian. For centuries the very fact of the *Magnifico's* cultural and political leadership seems to have obscured his phenomenal literary accomplishments. These are here sympathetically examined in all their extraordinary variety and, with all due credit to Politian, there is no question that a long-standing injustice is in process of being redressed.

Admiration for Professor Wilkins' competence in Italian literature is joined by a feeling of humility before the wealth of comparative information in which his book abounds. Although his principal aim has been to serve English-speaking readers, he indicates source- and influence-currents between Italy and France, Germany and Spain as well. He normally accomplishes this unobtrusively at the close of the treatment of the individual authors, not limiting himself to the obvious nor the most famous work influenced but tracing the chain of transmission through several generations and countries if need be. The only omission that has occurred to me, and it is a venial one, is the great interest of Ezra Pound in Cavalcanti. In the introduction to his final chapter, "Writers of the Twentieth Century," he dwells briefly on recent English-Italian and American-Italian relationships.

The final item in the volume (other than the Index) is "A List of English Translations and Books in English Dealing with Italian Literature." Spreading over eleven pages, it first lists books on background and on various periods and then proceeds chapter by chapter with translations and studies. This, I predict, will prove to be one of the most useful features of this useful and enjoyable work.

A. T. MACALLISTER

Princeton University

A Critical Bibliography of the New Stylistics Applied to the Romance Literatures, 1900-1952. By Helmut A. Hatzfeld. (The University of North Carolina Studies in Comparative Literature, No. 5). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953. Pp. xxii + 302.

Longtemps les études littéraires ont attaché plus d'importance à l'histoire de l'auteur et de l'œuvre qu'à l'œuvre elle-même; le style était abordé au dernier chapitre: des affirmations gratuites, des impressions subjectives lui faisaient un sort. Son étude systématique était le fait de grammairiens qui en traitaient en linguistes. Il a fallu un demi-siècle pour que la stylistique devienne une science indépendante des grammairiens et des esthéticiens: il faut toujours souligner que le style résulte d'un choix entre les possibilités qu'offre la langue, affaire, elle, des grammairiens; l'étude du style doit déterminer les éléments révélateurs de la psychologie de l'auteur et de ses intentions artistiques: cette tâche accomplie, et alors seulement, le jugement esthétique intervient et détermine si l'auteur a atteint son but. L'art de littérature ayant pour moyen d'expression le mot écrit, toute étude, toute critique littéraire devrait reposer sur la précision objective de la stylistique.

Ces principes sont bien mis en lumière par le professeur Hatzfeld dans son ouvrage, qui constitue un instrument de travail désormais indispensable à tous les chercheurs.

Cette bibliographie part de 1900, assez arbitrairement puisque l'explication de textes fleurissait dès avant cette date en France et que l'*Art de la Prose* de Lanson, chef-d'œuvre du genre, est de 1908 offrait une date plus significative que le début conventionnel du siècle. Elle s'étend jusqu'à 1950 et les délais de publication ont permis de la prolonger partiellement jusqu'en 1952 (seul, d'ailleurs, le premier addendum est critique). Elle couvre les littératures romanes avec une disproportion marquée en faveur du français (p. 43: environ 90 auteurs français cités contre 62 pour le reste du domaine roman). L'auteur n'en est sans doute pas responsable: il l'est quand il donne la préférence aux chercheurs allemands. M. Hatzfeld reconnaît qu'il ne pouvait être exhaustif (pp. xii-xiii): d'un point de vue idéal, c'est tout le domaine indo-européen que la stylistique comparée devrait englober. Puisqu'il fallait se limiter, la stylistique latine est bien plus proche de la française que l'espagnole ou l'italienne, et d'autre part les littératures antiques ont formé l'art littéraire chez tous les peuples romans et, ne serait-ce qu'à cause de l'influence de la rhétorique, il eût fallu en tenir compte (voir, par ex., 1014-1015).

La bibliographie se dit "critique": "dogmatique" conviendrait mieux. M. Hatzfeld passe sous silence la majeure part des travaux où le style était étudié avec des préoccupations syntaxiques ou, en général, linguistiques (p. 42): mais ces travaux, en dépit de leur méthode imparfaite, ont accumulé des relevés essentiels; il faudra donc aller les chercher dans des bibliographies générales comme Lanson ou Thieme, linguistiques comme

celle de Wagner, ou d'auteurs particuliers: critiquer, c'est guider en montrant les écueils, non en les cachant. L'exclusive apparaît plus grave encore: la distinction entre style et langue est maintenant acceptée, mais, à l'intérieur de la stylistique, certaines écoles (et M. Hatzfeld) ont tendance à limiter le style à la parole (au sens saussurien, bien entendu), c'est-à-dire à l'individu; il est étudié dans quelques traits singuliers auxquels tout se ramène, au lieu de mettre assez l'accent sur l'ensemble des procédés, certains hérités, certains adaptés, certains tout à lui; comme si la création esthétique la plus indépendante pouvait s'expliquer sans la langue, le langage, sans le milieu en somme d'où l'auteur s'élève ou se retire; elles risquent ainsi de se priver de l'élément de comparaison linguistique, dont un Bruneau se sert; cet élément, pourtant, permet seul de juger de l'originalité d'un style, originalité par rapport à l'état de langue à partir duquel ou contre lequel il s'est créé, bref de définir sa valeur esthétique propre (et en matière de langue, on définit en opposant); néanmoins M. Hatzfeld tend à condamner qui ne le suit pas, c'est-à-dire qui ne comprend pas par "stylistique nouvelle" celle de Spitzer et Spöerri (voir par ex. p. 46 ou no. 24).¹

Même si c'est là la "bonne" stylistique—elle l'est en partie—on craint que la sélection des ouvrages "importants" (p. xii) n'ait été orientée par ces préférences, d'autant que chaque fois qu'il cite un auteur de l'autre bord, M. Hatzfeld le juge et parfois l'exécute sans toujours donner d'attendus, sinon imparfaitement:² 269, *somewhat clumsy*; 283, *rather wholesale dealing*; 389, *an unsurpassed investigator* à de *negligible successors*; 1155, *hopeless failure* de Brunetière, qui n'a pas découragé M. Hatzfeld; 1235, *somewhat antiquated*; les maîtres qui ne sont pas du bon côté (*this side of the stylistic fence*, p. 166) se font donner sur les doigts: le précis de Cressot, 113, n'est que cité alors que *Le Style et ses techniques* est un excellent manuel pour l'étude méthodique du style, soit selon l'école française ou espagnole soit pour confirmer les résultats de la démarche spitzérienne; il souligne l'importance des possibilités phonétiques et rythmiques à côté de l'affectivité, celle de l'archaïque, du familier, etc., et deux études d'ensemble sur des textes de Balzac et de Flaubert montrent bien quels fruits porte l'analyse stylistique objective; encore Cressot a-t-il eu le bonheur d'entendre parler de la méthode allemande par son libraire (301), tandis qu'Hytier, assez imprudent pour discuter Spitzer (1453), a une position "inacceptable" (1374), alors qu'il ne s'agit de rien moins que de distinguer entre les styles conscient et inconscient; sans rejeter ce dernier, il a évidemment un autre système et la psychologie et l'esthétique de l'auteur s'y révèlent différemment. C'est d'ailleurs, dans ces deux cas, une curieuse méthode que de citer ce qui convient à une thèse et d'expédier sommairement le reste de l'ouvrage. L'œuvre énorme de Marouzeau qui montre le lien entre les stylisti-

1. M. Hatzfeld a résumé sa pensée, avec plus de libéralisme, dans "Stylistic Criticism as Art-minded Philology," *Y F S* 2, 1 (Spring-Summer 1949), 62-70.

2. Tous les chiffres cités sans indication de page renvoient aux numéros d'ordre.

tiques latine et française, et a particulièrement éclairé les problèmes du relief affectif et de l'ordre des mots, est minimisée. La controverse Bruneau-Spitzer (1506-1506 a) est close en faveur du dernier sans l'examen que l'on attendait. Le monument de l'*Histoire de la langue française*, stylistique depuis Bruneau, est salué en passant (324, 1201 où, justement, la caractérisation esthétique va si loin qu'elle fait peut-être illusion sans vraiment analyser) alors que des volumes comme les t. XII et XIII sont la mine la plus riche qu'on ait pour l'histoire des styles romantique et parnassien.

Certes M. Hatzfeld signale très souvent, avec scrupule, les mérites des autres écoles, mais la perspective d'ensemble reste faussée au détriment des travaux antérieurs à l'avènement de la stylistique nouvelle, ou hérétiques par rapport à celle-ci. On eût préféré une bibliographie comme l'*Année philologique*, chaque titre suivi d'un résumé objectif et toute unilatéralité écartée, dans les cas importants, par la référence aux compte-rendus critiques des œuvres citées: de la controverse jaillit la lumière et beaucoup, comme celui de G. Antoine sur le t. XII du Bruneau (*R H L*, 53, 2, 175-187) ont valeur indépendante.

L'information de l'auteur est remarquable. Parmi les lacunes (en-deçà de 1952), signalons toutefois le *Bon usage* de Grévisse, pourtant bien moins grammairer que répertoire comparatif d'exemples stylistiques; les articles du *Journal de Psychologie normale et pathologique* où ont paru les études de Lips sur le style de Flaubert, de Pommier sur le caractère psychologique de l'image flaubertienne (42, 274-294), de Lalo (cité en traduction, 23), de Pierre Emmanuel sur sa propre création poétique (44, 261-268), sans parler de numéros spéciaux comme *Grammaire et psychologie* (43, 1); Vendryès, "Phonologie et langue poétique," *R C C*, 37, 1 (Déc. 1935), pp. 22-34, à compléter avec M. Rutten, "Dichtkunst en phonologie," *R P H*, 28 (1950) Pp. 871-920; les travaux de Matoré sur le néologisme et la langue sous Louis-Philippe; J. Damourette, "Archaïsmes et pastiches," *F M*, 9 (1941) Pp. 181-206; pour Chateaubriand, la thèse de Dorette Keller (1943); pour Gide, *Die Sprachkunst Gides* (1929) de W. Schulz; pour Rousseau, E. Schutte "Zum Epitheton bei J. J. Rousseau," *Festschr. zum 16. Neuphilologenstag in Bremen* (Heidelberg, 1914), pp. 259-298; de Marouzeau, l' "Essai sur la stylistique du mot," *R E L*, 10 (1932), pp. 336-372; le "Rythme du vers français" de J. Schmidt, *A R*, 22 (1938), pp. 364-371; une collection d'explications de textes comme celle des *Cours de Sorbonne*. Au hasard de mes sondages: 45 ne parle pas d'euphonie, mais d'expressivité des sons; des travaux comme 971, 1416 exigent plus qu'une mention; 785 semble entériner les principes imprudents de Pius Servien; 787 oublie l'étude parallèle de Le Dû sur l'alexandrin hugolien; 996-998 veulent des détails et l'adynaton est bien une *impossibilité* évidente qui en met une autre en relief (voir E. Dutoit, *Thème de l'adynaton*, 1936, et son répertoire fort utile pour les thèmes des littératures de la Renaissance); 1321 n'est pas clair; les exclusions de 288 sont cavalières, pour le moins.

On aimerait, pour susciter des chercheurs, voir clairement délimiter les *terrae incognitae*³ de la stylistique: le Moyen Age et le XVIII^e siècle sont des parents pauvres; Cocteau, Montherlant attendent encore; le surréalisme, Gide sont à peine abordés; qu'a-t-on fait sur la concrétisation de l'abs-trait? sur les clichés et leur renouvellement? sur les tics de style? sur l'argot, non sous l'angle de la métaphore, mais comme procédé autonome (par ex. chez Carco, Céline, M. Aymé, etc.)? sur la mise en relief typographique telle que les italiques chez Stendhal ou Valéry?

A ce propos le plan adopté par l'auteur, s'il fait bien voir les grands courants de la stylistique, rend l'index par matières plus nécessaire que jamais. Il n'est malheureusement pas "digéré": entendez qu'il fourmille de mots étrangers là où l'anglais suffirait (*Achtsilbner* = Octosyllabic; *Commentaire psychologique*; *Commento estetico*; *Création littéraire*; *Discurso semi-directo*; *Ecriture* = Style; *Ecrivain*, etc.); que certains articles en sont incompréhensibles, parce que coupés d'un titre sans discernement (*Einfache Formen* de quoi? *Elucidation* n'indique pas qu'il s'agit d'un commentaire de Mallarmé; *Frankreich*, dans un livre où la France domine, prétend ne renvoyer qu'à la *Frankreichs Kultur* de Vossler; Lerch, *Typen*, devrait être *Word-order*, etc.). Il n'est pas complet non plus: je veux bien que toutes les matières y soient, ou du moins dans l'ouvrage même, mais il n'y a pas assez de rubriques: manquent Abstrais et Concrets, Adverbe (voir 126, 1323), Affectivité, fondamentale en stylistique depuis Bally, Anacoluthes, Archaïsmes et Néologismes (voir 281, 305), Cliché, Concision, Ellipse, Expressivité (*Expression*, *Hervorhebung*, *Intensity*, *Mise en relief*, ne la couvrent pas toute), Liaisons (voir 799-801); des auteurs déjà étudiés comme Renan; *Locution* est un fourre-tout. Au hasard des articles existants, il faudrait ajouter sous: *Ancien français*, 47-49; *Antithesis*, 555; *Argot*, 302, 1338; *Asyndeton*, 1104; *Colette*, 140; *Flaubert*, 1053-1054; *Hugo*, 163, 1000, 1014, 1407; *Humor*, 303; *La Fontaine*, 45; *Racine*, 1400, 1405, etc.⁴

Reste qu'en dépit de ses partis-pris et imperfections, l'ouvrage prouve l'indépendance trop contestée de la stylistique, démontre combien cette science neuve est indispensable, dont il sera longtemps l'indispensable instrument.

MICHAEL RIFFATERRE

Columbia University

Histoire d'un éditeur et de ses auteurs: P.-J. Hetzel (Stahl). Par A. Parménie et C. Bonnier de la Chapelle. Paris: Albin Michel, 1953. Pp. 685.

L'ouvrage que voici s'est organisé tout seul ou peu s'en faut, et ses

3. Signalées parfois, trop discrètement: 851, 1076, etc.

4. Fautes d'impression, à restituer: p. xviii, l. 21, d'Artrey, l. 35, Koninklijke; xx, 11, Civilisation; 23, no. 135 (et p. 287), Queneau; 24, 8 canaille; 46, 2, rapports; 72, la l. 6 est à l'envers; 154, no. 873, compléter publiées avant l'exil; 171, dern. l., français moderne; 184, 3, Jespersen; 250, 25, endormi; 263 no. 1480, Vierteljahresschrift, Stilkritik; 290, Orbis; 293, s.v. Vossler, Einsamkeit; 297, s.v. Goncourt, 287; 300; s.v. Racine, 869 et non 969.

fortunés auteurs ont le bon goût de n'en pas faire mystère: "Les lettres que reçut Hetzel,—disent-ils,—celles qu'il écrivit (c'était un excellent épistolier) rempliraient, si on les publiait intégralement, plusieurs volumes in-octavo. C'est une correspondance d'un intérêt considérable, d'une étonnante diversité et, sauf quelques pièces, inédite. Nous avons pu, rien qu'en reproduisant totalement ou en partie, et selon l'ordre chronologique, un grand nombre de ces missives, composer une véritable biographie d'Hetzel; nous nous sommes contentés de les faire précéder ou suivre d'un commentaire explicatif qui relie l'une à l'autre et les situe dans le temps".

Une aussi franche confession souligne d'emblée le fort et le faible de l'entreprise. 151 lettres inédites de George Sand, 81 de Victor Hugo, 13 de Balzac, 32 de Proudhon, 16 de Tourgueniev, 8 de Sainte-Beuve, 19 de Jules Verne, et quantité d'autres signées de noms presque tous illustres,—avons-nous besoin de bien davantage pour nous déclarer comblés? Mais, convenons-en aussi, la procédure adoptée par MM. Parménie et Bonnier de la Chapelle ne va pas sans quelque inconvénient. Si biographie il y a, elle garde des parties d'ombre, pour la raison que le trésor épistolaire d'où elle tire sa substance n'est pas partout de même ampleur. L'on accordera, par exemple, que la correspondance d'Hetzel éclaire admirablement son activité d'éditeur. Elle éclaire moins bien son existence d'homme politique au lendemain de février 1848. Elle éclaire plus mal encore la carrière d'écrivain qu'il fit sous le pseudonyme de P.-J. Stahl. Auteur secondaire à coup sûr, il le fut de manière représentative, si l'on ose dire, et il est permis de regretter que son *Voyage où il vous plaira* (1843), son *Esprit des femmes* (1851), sa *Théorie de l'amour et de la jalousie* (1853), ses *Bonnes fortunes parisiennes* (1862), ses études sur Voltaire et Perrault (1862), ses écrits pour la jeunesse enfin (*Morale familière, Histoires de mon parrain*, etc.), ne reçoivent ici qu'un traitement allusif et marginal. De fait, tout un côté de son caractère ne nous est révélé qu'à contre-jour, ou, plus exactement, tout un côté de sa formation. Avant de s'installer, sans quiétude béate d'ailleurs, dans la respectabilité bourgeoise; avant de "vieillir," comme il dit lui-même avec une pointe de regret, il avait mené peu ou prou la libre vie du dandy romantique, aiguisant ses qualités d'observation dans des milieux où, selon l'expression d'Emile Montégut, "moraliste n'est pas nécessairement synonyme de prédicateur de morale." Mais son courrier était plutôt déficient à cette époque, et ainsi en va-t-il de notre information.

En revanche, dès que nous pénétrons dans le bureau d'Hetzel éditeur, le récit, étayé de documents innombrables, devient instructif et même passionnant. Formé aux secrets du métier par le libraire Paulin, il fit paraître, pour ses authentiques débuts, les *Scènes de la vie publique et privée des animaux* (1840-1842). Ce coup d'essai, qui fut un coup de maître, le montre déjà dans le rôle actif qui restera le sien. Non seulement l'idée de l'ouvrage lui appartenait en propre, mais il avait su la faire agréer d'une pléiade d'écrivains de marque,—Nodier, Balzac, Janin, Musset, George Sand, etc.,

—dont la vertu première n'était pas l'esprit d'équipe ou la docilité aux suggestions d'autrui. Par la suite, Hetzel gardera le privilège peu commun d'inspirer confiance et dévouement au *genus irritabile vatum*; irritable certes, et trop fréquemment porté, dans son impécuniosité chronique, à tirer sur l'éditeur des chèques sans provision.¹ Si sa diplomatie fit merveille, la raison en est peut-être que, par-delà les qualités de cœur et de jugement, de tact et de fermeté tout ensemble, dont il sut faire preuve vis-à-vis de ses auteurs, il se considéra comme eux, et au su de chacun d'eux, investi d'une mission. Bon commerçant, il le fut sans doute, mais sans étroitesse et sans cupidité; et il connâtra, par l'effet de son désintéressement, des vicissitudes qu'un plus habile eût évitées.

Ce n'est pas à dire qu'on découvre chez lui une doctrine; ou, si doctrine il y a, les racines en sont politiques, au sens large du mot, plutôt que littéraires. Hetzel fut, somme toute, un grand libéral, comme certains savaient l'être au XIX^e siècle, un libéral optimiste et courageux qui, au lendemain du 2 Décembre, paya la rançon d'un long exil. Sur le déclin de sa vie, il n'avait rien perdu de sa foi au progrès des bonnes causes, ainsi qu'en témoigne sa lettre du 8 décembre 1879 à Edmond About: "Ne regrettez pas, mon cher About, cette absorption momentanée de toutes vos forces par la politique. Si jamais le temps fut d'en faire et de s'y donner tout entier, c'est le nôtre. Si je pouvais sortir des affaires, je m'y donnerais, et de bon cœur." Mais "les affaires," pour lui, c'était encore façon de diffuser "la vérité"; les vérités, plutôt, quelles qu'elles fussent, pourvu que leur expression lui semblât porter la marque de l'originalité et du talent. Son génie d'éditeur l'inclinait donc, non à servir une école, non même une idée, mais à pratiquer un éclectisme de bon aloi; ou, comme disent à juste titre ses biographes, soit à "révéler des écrivains nouveaux", soit à "ouvrir aux auteurs connus, soucieux d'étendre le champ de leurs travaux, des chemins peu frayés, hasardeux peut-être, mais bien tentants." Au bon grain qu'il sema de la sorte, quelque ivraie se trouva forcément mêlée; et il est, aux publications d'Hetzel, un côté de vulgarisation pédagogique, purement quantitatif et volumineux, qui empêche de le classer, comme Lemerre, par exemple, parmi les "aristocrates" de l'édition. Mais par ailleurs, et dans bien des cas, quelle admirable ouverture d'esprit! Il fut des premiers à discerner le génie de Stendhal et se rappelait mélancoliquement, sur ses vieux jours, quel "beau bouillon" il avait bu en essayant de réimprimer *Le Rouge et le Noir* et *La Chartreuse de Parme* peu après la mort de leur auteur. Il ajoutait, non moins mélancoliquement: "Croirait-on que j'ai bu un autre bouillon plus considérable avec la *Comédie Humaine* de Balzac in-8^o, et même la *première oeuvre complète* [i. e., la première édition des *Oeuvres complètes*] de George Sand? Il était de cinq à dix ans trop tôt quand j'ai fait cela." Et il faut noter encore, à son éternel crédit, sa longue association avec Victor

1. Hugo fut l'exception. Il était infiniment plus riche qu'Hetzel et lui tint la dragée haute au point de compromettre leur amitié par d'inexorables marchandages.

Hugo et la part qu'il prit dans la publication des recueils poétiques de l'exil (*Châtiments*, *Contemplations*, *Légende des Siècles*); l'audace qu'il eut d'éditer certains livres de Proudhon, jugés trop subversifs par ses confrères; l'admiration qu'il éprouva pour les *Mémoires* de Chateaubriand, alors méconnus et âprement critiqués; les tentatives qu'il fit auprès de Baudelaire pour que celui-ci lui confiât ses *Poèmes en prose*; sa vigueur à secouer la paresse de Tourgueniev et à propager en France l'oeuvre du romancier russe; enfin, sa "découverte" de Jules Verne, que notre époque encense à qui mieux mieux et qu'un chroniqueur de la *Saturday Review* appelait récemment "Mister Imagination." S'il est vrai que, l'âge survenant, ses facultés de renouvellement s'émoussèrent tant soit peu; s'il fit grise mine à *Madame Bovary*, à *Thérèse Raquin*, au premier roman de Huysmans, aux hardiesses de *Sapho*, le moins qu'on puisse dire est qu'il se trouvait en honorable compagnie et connut plus tard que d'autres la nostalgie sénéscente du passé. Au total, on peut souscrire au compliment pompeux, mais sincère, que lui décernait un jour Victor Hugo: "Les hommes tels que vous, . . . utiles comme éditeurs, devraient être tabous, objets sacrés, mis dans du coton. *Hetzel*, cela signifie cerveau d'où il sort du talent, boutique où l'on vend de la lumière. Vous donnez la becquée aux intelligences".

Il serait difficile, en vérité, à propos d'un autre éditeur du XIX^e siècle, qu'il se nommât Ladvocat, Gosselin, Michel Lévy, Lemerre, Charpentier, que sais-je encore! de réunir une gerbe de documents et de témoignages comparable à celle que nous offrent MM. Parménie et Bonnier de la Chapelle. Mais un ouvrage de cette sorte n'en accuse pas moins le besoin que nous avons d'explorer davantage les coulisses et officines de la littérature. Les livres ou articles consacrés aux grands éditeurs sont rares autant qu'ils seraient intéressants, voire indispensables. Une étude parue naguère, dans la *Revue des Sciences Humaines*, sur le libraire Flammarion, indiquait la voie. Dès l'instant que la voilà amplement défrichée, il est à souhaiter que d'autres s'y engagent et rapportent de leurs recherches de quoi satisfaire nos légitimes curiosités.

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

Columbia University

REVIEWS IN BRIEF

Ronsard and the Conventional Roman Elegy. By Robert E. Hallowell. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. 37, no. 4) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1954. Pp. viii + 176. At the age of 26, Pierre de Ronsard published four books of ambitious and energetic odes intended to rival Pindar. Then he relaxed. Although he later attempted to emulate Vergil, his epic on the founding of France by Trojan refugees remained incomplete. He had a soft heart; it was more natural for him to sing of the wine he drank and the ladies he adored than to create triumphal odes and archaising epics. He said himself that if any criticized him for writing less serious poetry, he would reply that love is not expressed in grand terms, but in "a fine low style," attractive and popular, like that of Tibullus and Ovid.

Le fils de Venus hait ces ostentations:
Il s'ust qu'on luy chante au vray ses passions,
Sans enflure ny fard, d'un mignard et dous stille,
Coulant d'un petit bruit comme une eau qui distille.

His later love poetry includes some of his most charming pieces. Light but apparently sincere, artful but apparently spontaneous, they seem to have flowed without premeditation from Ronsard's heart. And yet any reader who knows Tibullus and Ovid and Propertius will catch repeated echoes of Latin elegiac fancies in them, and detect many adaptations of classical themes. In fact, Ronsard was like most well-read poets in this: many of his personal emotional experiences translated themselves into poetry only after they had been refined and subtilized by passing through a form, a mould, created by another mind. It was not that he set out pedantically to imitate the ancients. It was rather that, for him, both books and life were stimuli: often he would prefer to write a poem about some aspect of love which a Roman poet had already treated, because he was moved both by the intensity of his personal experience and by his admiration for his long-dead predecessor.

Mr. Hallowell has explained this curious phenomenon in a sound and workmanlike book on Ronsard and the Roman elegists. The first section of his treatise shows how Ovid was known and admired through the Middle Ages while his fellow elegists Propertius and Tibullus were so utterly forgotten that, but for the survival of a few manuscripts in 'dead storage,' they could have been utterly lost; and how, with the appearance of the earliest printed editions of their work, the three at once became famous and re-created, in the modern languages, the elegiac poetry of which they had been the acknowledged masters. In the second section, Mr. Hallowell outlines the principal themes of Roman elegy—the contrast of love and war, the serenade of the lover locked out, and so forth—and then, with many interesting illustrations, shows how Ronsard developed them in his own poems. The third section and an appendix discuss and exemplify direct imitations of this type of Roman poetry in Ronsard and emphasize the fact that his admiration for the Roman elegists increased as he grew more mature.

Mr. Hallowell's book is well organized and filled with the results of careful and thoughtful research. It contains a few trivial slips and misprints, but none great

enough to warrant reproduction and castigation here: a list of them has been sent privately to the author for use when he revises his work. I have only two serious complaints to make about it. One is that it is not very gracefully written, and occasionally breaks into the jargon of the Ph.D. thesis: "It is readily apparent that the rôle of the Latin elegists, who were concerned almost exclusively with love in all its various manifestations, is of great importance as source material for the *Amours*." The other is that Mr. Hallowell seems to me to be a little bored with the Roman elegists. They were fine original artists—at least, so many later readers have believed—but he sometimes gives the impression that they were little more than hacks, all writing imitative poems on the same 'conventional' themes out of a pattern-book. In fact, their differences are quite as striking and as interesting as their resemblances. For the Greek and Roman poets (as for Ronsard and his friends) every literary genre had its formal patterns, its standard themes, and indeed its own special vocabulary; but to be an original and valuable writer was to transcend the conventions and, through the genre, to express one's own thought and personality. Mr. Hallowell has scarcely done full justice to the originality of the three Roman elegiac poets, and therefore he may (no doubt unintentionally) make some readers believe that Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid were merely copyists, who were copied in their turn by Ronsard. The stimulus which a poetic pattern gives to a poet, and the stimulus which one poet exercises on another, are more complicated and more genuinely creative impulses than anything which can be described in terms such as 'adaptation' and 'convention.' (GILBERT HIGHET, *Columbia University*)

Ludovico Ariosto: *Orlando furioso*. An English Translation with Introduction, Notes and Index, by Allan Gilbert. New York: S. F. Vanni, 1954. 2 vols. Pp. xl + 877 + 13 ill. This is the first full-scale translation of the *Furioso* since that of Christopher Johnson in 1827, which was itself the first translation in prose. There had been four prior translations in verse: Sir John Harington, 1591; William Huggins (claimed by Croker), 1755; John Hoole, 1783; and William Stewart Rose, 1823-31. The translation of Harington, though famous in its own right as an English Renaissance mirror of Italian Renaissance work, was not complete (it omitted, for example, more than half of the eighteenth canto), and to read it today is itself an exercise in translation. The other translations merited the censure they received in Foscolo's well known essay. The increasing ignorance of Italian and the absence of an acceptable translation have led to a general neglect in America of a work acknowledged, on hearsay, to be a masterpiece. Professor Gilbert has removed the excuse for such neglect. His translation is both accurate and readable. It may be argued that "the poetry is not there." Since poetry is by definition that which is not susceptible of paraphrase, it is quite true that the poetry is not there. Whoever seeks the poetry of a work must learn the language in which it exists. But as much of Ariosto's poetry as can be conveyed in English is here, and this is the more true because Professor Gilbert gives a simple prose rendering. A prose translation is on all counts better than a verse translation: it can more closely follow the modelling of the original in vocabulary and syntax; it does not by its own techniques and suggested atmospheres falsify the tone of the original; and it is more readable, especially in a long narrative work. A passage that would seem particularly unfair to Professor Gilbert is the essentially lyric reworking of Catullus in the famous

La verginella è simile alla rosa (1.42). In another work published this year, a translator of skill, sensitivity, and experience has attempted it in verse:

A little virgin is like unto a rose
Which in a bright garden on its native thorn
While it remains secure in lone repose,
Both sheep and shepherd leave it all forlorn,
Their favor to her both water and earth disclose,
The gentle breezes and the dewy morn:
Charming youths, love-stricken ladies do
Desire her, fair breasts and temples too.

Professor Gilbert's prose reads: "The young virgin is like the rose that neither flock nor shepherd draws near to while it rests alone and secure in a beautiful garden on its native thorn. The soft breeze and the dewy dawn, the water, the earth bend to favor her; gracious youths and enamoured women love to have their breasts and foreheads decked with her." A reader surely gets from the prose a sensation at once fresher and closer to the original than he can get from the verse. The advantage of prose becomes correspondingly greater in the bulk of the work, which is narrative and not lyric. The exact quality of Professor Gilbert's prose is somewhat difficult to define: it has a simplicity and an archaic (though not mannered) turn that often convey the atmosphere and tone of a *chanson de geste* rather than the lighter and richer tonality of Ariosto's world. The notes are tactful: they unobtrusively tell what one wants to know, and no more. The index is very helpful and so is the system of references which connect the various plot sequences. The introduction is admirable for a reader who comes to the poem with little prior knowledge. One might wish that Professor Gilbert had gone just a bit deeper into certain critical problems: his discussion of comedy in the *Furioso* seems superficial when compared with Momigliano's pages on Ariosto's irony, and his treatment of the poem's structure would have gained immeasurably if he had incorporated the results of the analysis of the Orlando-Angelica story given in Momigliano's *Saggio su l' "Orlando Furioso"*. A special commendation is due the publisher. These are probably the handsomest volumes to come from the Vanni press. The page arrangement, type, and binding are excellent; and the thirteen full page plates are interesting in choice and clearly reproduced. (E.W.)

Méditations avec un Essai de poèmes chrétiens. Par Jean de Sponde. Introduction de Alan Boase. Paris: Librairie José Corti, 1954. Pp. clxxiv + 208. It is less than twenty-five years since Alan Boase rediscovered the poetry of Jean de Sponde who until that time had been known only to a very small group as a minor sixteenth-century writer with poems in one or two rare anthologies. Since then, Professor Boase has sparked the study of Sponde's life and works and with the publication of a scholarly edition of the poetry (Sponde: *Poésies*. Alan Boase and François Ruchon. In the collection "Les Trésors de la littérature française." Genève: Editions Pierre Cailler, 1949) Sponde took his rightful place of eminence among the group of controversial Protestant poets of the period of the Wars of Religion.

The existence of other unknown works by Sponde was early attested to by a reference to the *Méditations sur les Pseaumes* in *La France Protestante*, IX, 315. With the publication of Volume 176 of the *Catalogue Générale des imprimés de la*

Bibliothèque Nationale it was discovered that a copy of this very work was to be found in the national collection. It is fitting that it should now reach us with meticulously edited notes and a scholarly introduction by Professor Boase.

There seems to be some doubt as to who should receive the honor for this second ready-made discovery. Professor Boase claims it by reason of an article in the *Mercur de France* for August 1, 1951 already announced in March of that year. François Ruchon appears to claim it with the blessing of Mlle Droz in a similar article in the *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* for September, 1951. Neither scholar mentions his former collaborator.

No one would want to denigrate the role Professor Boase has played in the rehabilitation of Sponde, but one cannot help noticing how he tends to look on the poet as his own special prerogative. He speaks disparagingly of all those who have had anything to do with the study of Sponde—F. Lachèvre (in his bibliographies), Marcel Arland, E. Droz, even the late François Ruchon. His introduction to the *Méditations* presents many fresh details on the life and connections of Sponde but even here he allows his prejudices to show. He spells the Christian name of Sponde's father as Enecot despite the fact that all other critics have used Inigo; the family name of Sponde's stepmother is de Osta instead of de Hosta and on two consecutive pages (xxiv-xxv) *L'Estocart* (the special study of Mlle Droz) is spelled *L'Estocart*, *Lestocart* and *L'Estocart*. One wonders if it is the same consideration which causes Professor Boase to leave out entirely the very necessary bibliography which might have been considerably enlarged from the one given in the earlier collection of the poetry.

But all this is trivial. The important thing really is the availability of the text of the *Méditations sur les Pseaumes* and the Christian poems following. They tell us much about Sponde during the period 1584-1591. They show that he was firmly, even passionately Protestant despite the later conversion to Catholicism. They reveal his mastery of French prose and make one turn to Bossuet or Claudel for adequate terms of comparison. They raise him far above minor contemporaries such as Duplessis Mornay and Jean de La Ceppède and rank him along with Du Bartas and D'Aubigné as the most important Protestant apologists of the late sixteenth century. (VICTOR E. GRAHAM, *University of Michigan*)

La Doctrine De Port-Royal: La Morale. Par Jean Laporte. 2 vols. Paris: J. Vrin, 1951-1952. Pp. ix + 212; 464. A sa mort, Jean Laporte laissait entre autres un volumineux manuscrit sur la Morale de Port-Royal. Mlle Jeanne Russier, auteur d'une étude appréciée sur *La Foi selon Pascal*, s'est attachée à réduire le texte de Laporte aux dimensions de deux volumes. La sagesse et la ferme clarté qui caractérisent tous les ouvrages de Laporte sont respectées. Malgré la compression à laquelle Mlle Russier dut assujettir le manuscrit original, on découvre encore longueurs et répétitions; mais elles sont de toute évidence le fait d'une méthode exhaustive dont les lecteurs de Laporte ont déjà pu admirer la marche circonspecte.

En effet, cette méthode avait assuré une rare qualité aux thèses de Laporte sur *La Doctrine de Port-Royal*. Sous forme plus abrégée, le remarquable article de Laporte sur Pascal et la doctrine de Port-Royal, publié par la *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* en 1923, illustre la pénétration d'une pensée assez humble pour se soumettre à la vérité.

Les présents volumes continuent donc les thèses de 1923; de la discussion de la doctrine de Port-Royal ils passent à l'exposé de la Morale. En dépit des trente ans qui séparent ces études, l'enchaînement de la spéculation à la pratique s'effectue sans heurt. Ceci du fait que ses recherches ont confirmé Laporte dans son premier jugement, à savoir: Port-Royal enseigna non le jansénisme, mais un augustinisme parfois inspiré de Jansénius; Port-Royal, face aux calvinistes et aux jésuites, représente la permanence de la Tradition; en Port-Royal thomisme et augustinisme rencontrent de fidèles interprètes. Laporte n'argue point autour de la prétendue hérésie de Port-Royal. Il ne soulève même pas la question, car pour lui l'orthodoxie de Port-Royal paraît inattaquable.

Laporte définit la morale de Port-Royal à travers celle d'Arnauld. On ne saurait incriminer son choix. Aussi, l'auteur s'est-il consacré à un exposé minutieux de la théologie morale d'Arnauld. Ces deux volumes sont le fruit de sa persévérance. Que le lecteur ne s'attende pas à une discussion critique, Jean Laporte conduit son sujet avec un minimum d'intrusion: il observe et condense. En sorte, il résume la morale d'Arnauld—résumé qui a l'avantage de nous dispenser d'une lecture dont la prolixité a toujours découragé les esprits les mieux disposés. Tout Arnauld, malheureusement, ne se trouve pas dans la *Fréquente Communion*. Et, s'il a peu varié par la suite, Arnauld a cependant grandement étendu les conséquences de sa première perspective morale. Pour le moins, ces volumes serviront à réhabiliter une pensée dont personne n'a jamais nié l'importance... faute de temps pour la lire.

L'exposé de Laporte éclaire la stature d'Arnauld, le "Grand Arnauld." On est frappé de la vigueur et de la santé de cette morale. Quelle fermeté dans la dialectique! Quelle habileté à jeter dans une alliance compromettante calvinistes, jésuites, et, le cas échéant, quietistes! Mais aussi, quelle fonderie honnêteté! Et, malgré de surprenantes interprétations de la doctrine calviniste, quel constant souci de maintenir à l'Esprit sa vérité et à la Lettre sa dignité. A cet égard, on devra noter combien la doctrine protestante rapportée par Arnauld semble étrangère à celle prêchée de nos jours.

Le premier volume de ce vaste résumé concerne la Loi morale. Arnauld en conçoit le but comme une "conversion" amenée par l'identification de la volonté individuelle à la volonté divine—la vertu chrétienne se signalant par une "bonne volonté" d'accomplir la Loi. Le deuxième volume traite de la Pratique des sacrements et de l'Eglise; il se termine sur deux appendices consacrés à l'histoire de la dispute autour du Formulaire—on appréciera ce tableau succinct d'une cause embrouillée. Au cours du deuxième volume éclate la raison pour laquelle un Joseph de Maistre pouvait si ardemment détester Port-Royal. Comment aurait-il convenu d'une définition de l'Eglise ramenée à celle d'un gouvernement sans domination? Et comment aurait-il admis soit l'intransigeante défense de la liberté chrétienne devant l'Etat, soit l'exaltant appel à un honneur qui exige parfois une révolte de la conscience?

Laporte remet donc en lumière la fidélité de Port-Royal à la Justice et à la Charité. Son exposé devient, par la nature même des choses, une définition de la perpétuité de la morale chrétienne. Arnauld s'y dresse, aussi bien contre Malebranche qu'il estime que contre les laxistes qu'il accuse ou contre Spinoza qu'il dénonce, comme un puissant architecte de la Tradition. (J.-J. DEMOREST, *Duke University*)

Self-Interest. By Nicolo Secchi. Translated by William Reymes. Edited by Helen Andrews Kaufman. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1953. Pp. xxix + 106. Les historiens de la comédie anglaise, dans la période qui précède la restauration, et les comparatistes soucieux de mesurer, par rapport aux influences espagnoles, l'apport beaucoup plus considérable du théâtre italien, seront les plus intéressés par cette excellente édition d'une traduction à peu près inconnue; mais elle ne laissera pas indifférents les moliéristes. Il s'agit de la version en anglais, en vers blancs, par un gentilhomme du Norfolk, William Reymes (1629-1660), d'une des quatre comédies en prose de Nicolo Secchi, *L'Interesse*, bien connue pour avoir fourni à Molière l'intrigue compliquée de son *Dépôt amoureux*, exception faite des scènes qui ont donné leur titre à cette œuvre et de divers emprunts.

L'Interesse, rappelle Mrs. Kaufman, fut publié en 1581, 1587 et 1628; il eût été bon de nommer les éditeurs. Gustave Michaut, dans son édition posthume des *Œuvres de Molière*, ne mentionne que l'édition de 1581, à Venise, chez Francesco Ziletti; dans sa *Jeunesse de Molière* il ne connaissait que l'édition de 1585, à Venise également. Personne n'a précisé de quelle édition Molière s'était servi et Mrs. Kaufman, qui emploie celle de 1587, ne nous dit pas non plus laquelle Reymes a utilisée. Est-ce que les trois éditions connues, fort postérieures à la mort de Secchi (1560), se copient au point d'interdire de déceler dans la traduction de Reymes des différences révélatrices de leur source?

Cette traduction, *Selfe Intrist or The Belly Wager, A pleasant Italian Comoeidie written in prose by Sig^r Nicolo Secchi and translated into English by W. R. per gusto suo*, constitue la seconde partie d'un manuscrit conservé à la Folger Shakespeare Library. Ce qui la rend intéressante, outre sa fidélité (à quelques détails près) à laquelle Mrs. Kaufman rend hommage et les indications scéniques qui ont été ajoutées au texte, peut-être dans l'espoir d'une représentation, dont on ne sait si elle eut jamais lieu, c'est qu'elle est la seule dont l'éditeur a pu constater l'existence dans aucune langue; ainsi les moliéristes qui savent un peu d'anglais et ont le malheur d'ignorer l'italien ne joueront plus aux devinettes avec le texte publié par Louis Moland, malheureusement sans traduction, en annexe au *Dépôt* dans son édition revue des *Œuvres de Molière*. Mrs. Kaufman, qui traite plus abondamment des ressemblances (généralement négligées) entre *L'Interesse* et *Twelfth Night* et de la vogue de la comédie italienne en Angleterre aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles, n'avait pas à s'arrêter longtemps à l'adaptation de Molière. Sa comparaison des deux pièces reste sommaire. Elle aurait pu indiquer, du moins, que Gustave Michaut dans sa *Jeunesse*... avait poussé cette analyse plus loin. Elle aurait pu également rappeler que le *Dépôt* a été "créé" à Béziers en décembre 1656 et publié à Paris en novembre 1662. Ces détails ont quelque intérêt en raison de l'impossibilité de dater la traduction anglaise de Reymes, à laquelle, nous dit-on, il a dû travailler "in the years just prior to his death in 1660." Pourquoi pas plus tôt, au collège ou au sortir du collège? En tout cas, ce jeune anglais contemporain du grand comédien français sera maintenant, par la grâce de Mrs. Kaufman, modestement associé à la gloire de Molière pour avoir, à peu près en même temps que lui, distingué les mérites, un peu bien évaporés pour nous, de la meilleure comédie de Nicolo Secchi. (J.H.)

The Structure of Spanish History. By Americo Castro. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954. Pp. 689. Readers of Spanish have had access to this book since

1948 when it was published in Argentina. Under the title, *España en su historia*, it has come to be recognized in the Spanish world as a classic of historiography—a book already a classic in the sense that Huizinga's *Waning of the Middle Ages* and Burckhardt's *Civilization* are classics. Now it appears in English, splendidly translated by Edmund L. King and extensively revised by its author; and the reviewer of this new version finds his task as much one of "preparation" as of criticism. He must prepare the readers of English for their experience with Castro's radical and frequently unfamiliar innovations in method and approach. Certainly one of the poorest services he can render the book and the reader is to limit himself (as has been sometimes the case) to objections of individual aspects or ideas—or to occupy himself wholly with his own opinions. A classic need not and ought not be "re-viewed" in the ordinary sense of the word.

But what makes *The Structure of Spanish History* a classic? In the first place, I would mention its original research on so many different aspects of the Spanish past: poetry, legends, beliefs, languages, institutions as well as matters more properly historical such as the dynastic intrigues responsible for the founding of Portugal. For Hispanists—as their enthusiasm and at times bitter objections prove—the book has been revolutionary. Even more important than this kind of originality, however, is Castro's ability to synthesize, to derive his wide range of content from a single order or "structure" of meaning. His vision of Spanish history and, indeed, his vision of history itself as "structuralized" is utterly new. As such classics must (and here Burckhardt is an inevitable point of comparison), the book proposes a new definition of what history is and of man's place in it. Particularly in its new revision (a Spanish version was published in Mexico simultaneously with the English), it becomes something more than the best book about Spanish history to be published in recent years. It becomes a profound and intense meditation on the historical nature of man.

Although this meditation pervades the *Structure of Spanish History*, it is in the new second chapter that Castro makes most explicit his "Fundamental Assumptions." Taking an approach that anthropologists and sociologists of knowledge should find interesting, Castro begins by rejecting the temporal approach to history, particularly the rigid evolution of an international "Geist" through the Romanesque, Gothic, Renaissance, Baroque, etc. Instead he prefers to trace the "biographies" of national-linguistic unities, in this case the "biography" of Spain and Spanish. Yet this does not imply a theory of national "character" (such as Madariaga's brilliant generalizations about *Englishmen*, *Frenchmen*, *Spaniards*), nor does it describe, to use Pritchett's, more fashionable and less deterministic phrase, "the Spanish temper." The "biography" of which Castro speaks is founded, as all good biographies must be, on an intuition of the quality of Spanish consciousness or self-awareness. It is an attempt (in the tradition not only of Wilhelm Dilthey and "Werttheorie" but also of Unamuno and the "Generation of '98") to describe the way the Spanish mind has sought for values and made its history from within. This "way" or "mode" of historical expression is the limiting structure of history (pure science, for example, is of little interest to Spaniards), but, at the same time, Castro hastens to assure us, it is no determinant. It is precisely in terms of a limiting national "structure" or "hierarchy" of values that freely original historical expression in the fields of art, politics, religion, etc. can be achieved.

A good biographer, however, must do more than intuit personality structure (the comparison is useful but inexact, of course). He must go on to furnish an explanation of the way such a structure has come into being, the way it emerges from what Castro terms a "dwelling place." The phrase is spiritual and not geographical, and, in the case of Spain, it refers to the long centuries of cohabitation and of quarrel of Christian and Moor. Castro is, surprisingly enough, the first historian to assess seriously the continuing meaning of these centuries to Spanish and Spanish-American life. It is for him the situation, the painful circumstance, out of which greatness and the heart-breaking ineptitudes of that life have sprung. The analysis of the way these two cultures resisted each other and at the same time fused with each other is masterful. Anyone who is interested in Spain or its former colonies will automatically be interested in this book—as will anyone who is in search of a fascinating new way of writing history. (STEPHEN GILMAN, *Harvard University*)

Voltaire's Correspondence. Vols. IV-VI. Edited by Theodore Besterman. Les Délices, Genève: Institut et Musée Voltaire, 1953. Pp. xix + 263; xx + 424; xx + 318. The handsome volumes of Mr. Besterman's edition of Voltaire's correspondence continue to appear, a boon to those who enjoy Voltaire's letters in themselves and to all students of the French eighteenth century. These three volumes, each covering a calendar year, are entitled, respectively, "A Time for Thought" (1735), "The Turning-Point" (1736), and "Physics and Metaphysics" (1737).

The first year was marked by continued persecution over the *Lettres philosophiques* and a sincere effort to discover, in correspondence with Père Tournemine and others, just how heretical was his hypothesis of "la matière pensante." Voltaire still maintains (IV, 207) that it is probable "que nous pensons par le cerveau, de même que nous marchons avec le pied," but has to admit that he was "un juste à qui la grâce a manqué" (IV, 94). Poems, history, and plays proceed their pace: "genius grows bolder against persecution" (IV, 12), "huit chants de la Pucelle de faits" (IV, 26), the *Siècle de Louis XIV* is taking shape (IV, 16-18), and *Alzire* is competing with Pompadour's *Zoraïde* (IV, 221-222).¹

Voltaire is in hiding during the early months of 1736, because of a false rumor of the appearance of five cantos of *La Pucelle*, and at the close of the year, at the warning of friends, he flees from Cirey and Mme du Châtelet to escape persecution over "cette bagatelle," *Le Mondain*. For the moment, a note of deep resentment creeps into letters to intimate friends. There are many quotable passages, as usual: "J'apprends que l'abbé des Fontaines est malheureux [persecuted] et dès ce moment-là je lui pardonne" (V, 30); reading Pope's *Essay on Man* at long last, he finds it "mêlé d'idées bien fausses sur le bonheur" (V, 57); to his former "pion," Abbé d'Olivet, he writes, after reading Newton: "Aimez-moi, consolez-moi d'être si petit" (V, 282). There are, of course, many references to *Le Mondain*: Mme du Châtelet is translating Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* in April (V, 137), Voltaire sends a copy of *Le Mondain* to Cideville in August (V, 208), who replies with an

1. I would suggest that Letter 811, with its references to Melon's essay on commerce and to Voltaire's "badinage innocent" should be put a year later. The reference seems to be definitely to *Le Mondain*, and the language of the letter resembles that of Letter 1156, where Voltaire again speaks of *Le Mondain* as "un ouvrage très innocent."

unusually delicate poem (V, 268). Mr. Besterman fixes the date of Voltaire's flight as during the night of 8 December.²

Ostensibly on his way to see Prince Frederick, Voltaire spent the early months of 1737 in serious study among Holland's notable Newtonians and metaphysicians: "Il faut donner à son âme toutes les formes possibles" (VI, 71), he remarked, in anticipation of Gide. Frederick sent him Wolf's works, but Voltaire liked neither "chain of being" nor "pre-established harmony" (VI, 86) and notes that Wolf is almost wholly "dans les principes de Leibnitz" (VI, 278). We have too long been deceived in believing that Voltaire had a change of heart toward Pope and Leibniz, as he himself asserted, at the time of his Lisbon poem. This volume as a whole does indeed show other forms of Voltaire's soul, because of the great number of letters to his business agent, Abbé Moussinot, and to the young Frederick, with whom he delighted in arguing about natural law, free-will, and God's ways with man. He is already being playful about "l'infiniment grand et l'infiniment petit" (VI, 153), a state of mind that will be crystallized in *Micromégas*.

The Musée et Institut Voltaire has now been inaugurated, ten more volumes of the *Correspondence* are ready for the press, and a series of Voltaire Studies is announced, with contributions solicited. (N.L.T.)

George Sand. Par Pierre Salomon. Paris: Hatier-Boivin, 1953. Pp. 176. This volume is number 38 of a series now called "Connaissance des Lettres," but which was originally founded by Paul Hazard as "Le Livre de l'Étudiant." The title of the original collection indicates the scope and intent of the book. It was obviously meant to collect what information is known about an author and present it to students in concise form for examination purposes.

As an integral part of the series, and within the limitations of this type of synthesis, the book is eminently successful. M. Salomon draws on Karénine's standard biography, Pailleron's recent study, as well as on Fahmy and André Maurois. The work is based on the critical assumption that Sand's work cannot be understood "que si l'on y démêle l'influence des événements extérieurs." Hence the book is arranged chronologically in standard fashion, with each section neatly and logically subdivided.

Unfortunately however, as M. Salomon admits, very little is still known of certain aspects of Sand's life. There still exists no accurate catalogue of her manuscripts, no collected and edited correspondence, nor even any basic chronology of her life. Thus, the present study has the second function of a *mise au point* and indicates clearly the vast work still to be done on George Sand. M. Salomon has merely indicated the great gaps in our knowledge of the life of Sand.

However, the very excellence of this essay within the limits indicated by the original title of the series has contributed to a deficiency in the study. M. Salomon uses the classic French academic approach to an author, emphasizing the facts of George Sand's existence, detailing her love affairs, and listing her works. In all fairness it must be said that the small number of pages permitted any writer in this series did not allow the author room for much more. Nonetheless, M. Salomon allots only eleven pages to Sand's contribution to the art of the novel, a serious omission, since she remains in literature only by virtue of her work as a writer.

2. Internal evidence concerning a clock that Voltaire was offering to Mme Quinault indicates to me that Letter 1171 should have been put before Letter 1160.

This meager treatment seriously affects the value of the book for anyone seeking more than the bare facts of an author's life. In the preface, M. Salomon lists a series of questions which he does not attempt to answer. One of them, for example, asks why George Sand's popularity, so great in her day, has faded in the twentieth century. Perhaps the answer lies in a consideration of Sand as an artist rather than as a political theorist. After all, the only justification for a full-scale treatment of George Sand is to assess and evaluate the writer's work, not to recount her life on the assumption that this somehow contributes to an aesthetic judgment. Admittedly, this is only a point of view, but it nevertheless seems indicated that much of the work of the modern scholar will be to fill in the gaps of our knowledge of how authors wrote and to what extent they utilized their chosen medium to comment on the basic problems of life. (ALBERT J. GEORGE, *Syracuse University*)

Benito Pérez Galdós and the Creative Process. By Walter T. Pattison. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954. Pp. ix + 146. Professor Pattison's little volume is one of the few really distinguished pieces of Galdosian criticism yet written and deserves to rank with the studies of Berkowitz, Casaldueiro, Eoff, del Río and a very few others, although it is different in nature from all of them, being far more detailed and extensive in its range, yet sharper and more intensive in its focus. Essentially an examination and elucidation of the literary genes and chromosomes of *Gloria* (18-113) and *Marianela* (114-136), two early social novels of Galdós' *primera época*, this criticism is a compact product of exhaustive and painstaking methods of research, used for the first time in the field of Spanish fiction, as the book jacket correctly claims.

Aided somewhat by the theories and practices of such critics as Revilla, Audiat and Lowes, Pattison takes the position that the literary artist cannot create out of nothing and that his imagination can utilize only materials already in his mind and does so by making rearrangements and new associations of them. He shows what these materials were, makes clear what the originality of the Galdosian arrangements is, and suggests why and how Galdós arrived at the particular patterns which are *Gloria* and *Marianela*. Pattison is thoroughly acquainted with not only the Galdosian bibliography but also the literary and intellectual periodicals in Galdós' Spain. More than this, he has spared no effort to visit people and places that might shed new light on Don Benito's creative process; and he has examined the books remaining (in 1951) in Galdós' library and, with especially fruitful results, the markings and annotations in Galdós' hand which he found in them.

A two-page "Introduction" is followed by a short chapter called "Formative Period: Foreign Influences," in which the Galdós library and the readings Galdós attributes to the highly autobiographical Vicente Halcónero in *España trágica* are significantly related. Next come the long study called "The Genesis of *Gloria*" and the shorter "The Creation of *Marianela*." These are followed by a weakly redundant "Conclusion" which seems quite unnecessary since Pattison's real conclusions have been progressively and cumulatively presented in each of the two preceding chapters, and finally by a useful and revealing "Index."

In "The Creation of *Marianela*" Pattison's contribution is, with all due credit given to Clarín, Revilla, Menéndez y Pelayo, Ortega Munilla, and Casaldueiro: 1) to make precise the influences and contributions of Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*

and of the Romanticism and sentimental humanitarianism of Hugo and Sue; 2) to show the relationship of these to Comte's positivism in the formation of the novel; 3) to confirm that the model for the fictional Socartes was the mining village of Reoc  n; 4) to suggest that in Gald  s' Spain the surgeon Golf  n was bound to be the most likely, if not the only likely, embodiment of positivism; and, most originally, 5) to show from Gald  s' library annotations that the creator of *Marianela* had—surprisingly and with little justice—envisaged her model Mignon as “a victim of social oppression” (134).

In “The Genesis of *Gloria*” Pattison has mastered a vast amount of varied material, reducing it to a readily comprehensible size without wholly obscuring the magnitude of his undertaking and achievement. He accepts Gald  s' explanation to Clar  n that “*Gloria* was the result of a sudden flash of inspiration” (18) as he was walking in the Puerta del Sol but insists that “the inspiration . . . was the moment of crystallization when a whole series of stored-up impressions fell into a pattern” (19). In detail, Gald  s was right, too, when he said that Fic  briga existed only on the *mapa moral* of Spain, but nevertheless it contained “elements of real towns” (21), which Pattison skillfully proves were chiefly Castro Urdiales and Santillana del Mar, with features of Santander and other Cantabrian places which cannot be so precisely fixed. The critic then proceeds to study “The *Ambiente Moral*,” “Religion and Religions,” “*Krausismo* in Other Novels,” “Shipwrecks” (in which Gald  s' detailed indebtedness to Feuillet's *Histoire de Sibylle* is made clear), “Priests—French and Spanish,” “*Gloria* and *Sibylle*,” “Love for a Heretic,” “The Bible and a Banquet,” “*Ivanhoe*,” “The Jewish Hero” (wherein Daniel Morton is revealed as “a composite of the most diverse suggestions—the romantic hero, Don Quijote, Benito Spinoza, Heinrich Heine, the Wandering Jew, Jesus, and Don Ignacio Bauer,” p. 90), “More About Characters,” and “The Creative Process.”

Inconsistencies in the novel, especially of topographical details and character traits, are likened by Pattison to seams or joints in an imperfect job of welding; these are often crucial in the determination of many contributory elements in *Gloria*. For example, the edifying actions and r  le of the priest D. Silvestre Romero early in the novel contrast shockingly with the “artistic incongruity” (64) of his later despicable behavior. This enables Pattison to demonstrate that the saintly D. Angel and D. Silvestre both derive from a *desdoblamiento* of the Abb   Renaud in Feuillet's novel. Besides, Romero was first presented as wealthy and later as poor, another inconsistency resulting from an imperfect welding of two models: the Abb   Renaud of poor peasant stock and the well-to-do Prior Aymer of *Ivanhoe*.

When Pattison moves from the materials to the process of creation, he recognizes (4) that he is taking his readers into a more speculative area. Nevertheless, most of his reconstructions are plausible and highly convincing. This reviewer, however, cannot share his belief that Gald  s deliberately sought material for *Gloria* before the composition of the novel, although neither can he categorically deny that possibility. The data presented simply do not prove the thesis. For example, early quotations show that Gald  s had marked his Bible “by the time he was starting to write the novel” (76), that he must have had “the political action and the resultant banquet in mind even as he began to write the book” (77) and that “in all probability he planned it on the suggestion in the Psalms” (77). But it does not follow that “he must have been reading and marking part of his Bible with the definite purpose

of seeking out materials for his new book" (77). Doubtless, Galdós intended to write more books, and in a sense all his experience, including Biblical readings, was to be grist for his mill. But the new book at that time was not necessarily *Gloria*, for he could not have received the suggestion for this book from the Bible and at the same time have gone to the Bible seeking materials for it. Against this patent illogicality and inherent contradiction, the marked Biblical passages (there were many more that were not used in *Gloria*) would seem to provide no evidence that Galdós knew what kind of book he was going to write, but only that he was interested in the passages, perhaps for some possible but clearly undetermined use in the future.

Similarly, it is unnecessary to wonder with Pattison whether the initial impetus for the idea of pitting Jewish intolerance against neo-Catholic intolerance might have come to Galdós from Heine's letters or from visits to "Comillas and San Vicente de la Barquera the summer before" (112). Such an impetus could have come from the Bible or from Auerbach's novelized version of Spinoza's life, translated as *Benito Espinosa* in 1876 by Galdós' krausista friend González Serrano and a contributory element to the formation of *Gloria*, as Pattison has already successfully demonstrated (101). Not only must this element account for an inconsistency in the development of Morton's characterization in Part II, as Pattison has indicated (105), it must also have been in Galdós' mind before he began the novel, for only from this book was Galdós likely to know of the fictitious love affair between Spinoza and a Catholic girl (103).

Exception must be taken to the 'law' of the creative process which Pattison proposes and which would say that "those characters which most accurately reflect the dominant emotion of the novel have the least literary origin" (110). Such a law would be supported by *Gloria*'s father, whose prototype Pattison has found in Galdós' charming but intolerant Cantabrian friends Pereda and Menéndez y Pelayo. But *Gloria*'s uncle the bishop Don Angel with his saintliness and his censure of latitudinarianism is central to the dominant emotion, and Pattison has shown that this character derives from the Abbé in Feuille's novel. Similarly, Daniel is central, but he is a composite of both literary and personal elements.

Our dissents are not meant to detract, nor can they, from the tremendous contribution this book makes. Not only does it provide a substantial and original increase in the accuracy and richness of our knowledge of two of Galdós' early novels; appreciation of *Marianela* and especially of *Gloria* as creations of Galdós, and in the Spain of 1877 and 1878, will never be the same again. Beyond this, Pattison's exemplary book may well be emulated by scholars who would bring the methods and results of the most exacting research scholarship to bear constructively on literary criticism. (W. H. SHOLMAKER, *University of Kansas*)

Avec Marcel Proust, suivi de dix-sept lettres inédites de Proust. Par Edmond Jaloux. Paris—Genève: La Palatine, 1953. Pp. 153. Edmond Jaloux (1878–1949) will perhaps be remembered less as a novelist or short story writer than as a critic. In this role he stands out as one of the keenest, most independent writers of his generation. His independence may at least in part be explained by his provincial origin. Born and educated in a suburb of Marseille, he remained, even in later years, relatively free from the pressures and prejudices of Parisian literary circles. An avid reader

from his youth, his familiarity with English, Russian, German and other literatures gave him an exceptional breadth in judging the writers of his time.

He claimed the distinction of having, when he was only fifteen, discovered Proust in the *Revue Blanche*. When *Les Plaisirs et les jours* appeared three years later, Jaloux' enthusiasm for its unknown author was so great that he purchased another copy of the costly volume, which he presented to his friend Francis de Miomandre. Subsequently, when he sent some of his own works to Proust, the latter, on each occasion, duly wrote to acknowledge their receipt in his customary complimentary manner. Although Jaloux moved to Paris in 1911, the two did not meet until the last year of the war. Meanwhile, Jaloux had won the Prix Fémina (1909) for his novel *Le Reste est silence* . . . , and was establishing a reputation as a critic. Thus his intelligent appreciation of Proust's work, as the successive volumes appeared, was to become an important factor in the comprehension of Proust by the reading public. Among Proust's contemporary critics, Jaloux was doubtless the one who best understood and interpreted *A la recherche du temps perdu*.

In *Avec Marcel Proust*, Jaloux' major critical essays on Proust have been assembled, together with the seventeen letters that Proust addressed to Jaloux. Early articles such as the notes on the attribution of the Prix Goncourt and on *Sodome et Gomorrhe*, already available in *L'Esprit des livres*, have been omitted. Included are the articles reviewing *La Prisonnière*, *Albertine disparue* and *Le Temps retrouvé*, and one of the two best studies thus far made of *Les Plaisirs et les jours*, the other being Gide's.¹ These articles are preceded by two essays of a later period, in which an attempt is made to re-evaluate Proust's work and to determine its place in world literature. Were they both dated and presented in chronological order to reveal clearly that they were originally separated by an interval of twenty years, they would show an interesting evolution in Jaloux' judgments about Proust. The first of the essays in order of presentation was presumably written not long before Jaloux' death, whereas the second was published in 1931.² Jaloux appears, for example, to have changed his mind completely about the question of Bergson's influence on Proust. In the 1931 study, he categorically denies any such influence: "... cette méditation était chez Proust si puissante, si totale, si invincible, qu'il est absolument impossible de voir dans ces 'influences' autre chose que des rencontres et des reconnaissances" (p. 33); in the later essay, he has reconsidered the matter and concludes, on the contrary, that Bergson was indeed a source of inspiration to Proust: "Si originale que soit son œuvre romanesque, elle n'en prend pas moins sa source dans le formidable massif métaphysique de Henri Bergson" (p. 19). Where in the earlier study Jaloux has expressed a preference for Proust the psychologist and explorer of the subconscious, in the later one he shows a predilection for the poet, the creator of a world of fantasy which Jaloux does not hesitate to rank alongside Shakespeare's or Goethe's. On the whole, Jaloux' analyses and comments remain among the most penetrating we have on Proust.

The Proust letters are published in some chronological disorder, with few dates

1. *Les Nouvelles littéraires*, 9 February and 4 October 1924, 6 January 1926, 3 and 10 December 1927. Gide's essay, "En relisant *Les Plaisirs et les Jours* après la mort de Proust," was reprinted in Proust's *Lettres à André Gide*, Neuchâtel: Ides et Calendes, 1949.

2. Except the first six pages, the first essay appeared in *La Revue de Paris*, 58^e année (June 1951), 13-27. Ten of the 17 Proust letters were included. The second study was first published in the *Revue Hebdomadaire*, 21 November 1931, pp. 289-309.

or notes. The letter concerning Jaloux' Preface to *La Double Méprise* is important; in it, Proust gives a justification for his method of "telling all." The letter should, however, be read in conjunction with the Preface (reprinted in *L'Esprit des livres*), where one can see why Proust takes so defensive an attitude toward Mérimée. We list here our tentative datings for the letters: Pp. 117-118: [vers la fin de 1903?]; p. 119: [vers mai-juin? 1904], instead of "(1903)"; p. 120: [vers avril? 1909]; pp. 121-123: [mai? 1918]; pp. 124-125: [second semestre 1921]; p. 126: [mai 1920]; p. 127: [vers mai-juin 1922?]; pp. 128-131: [mai 1921], instead of "(Avril 1921)" by reason of the allusion to an article in the *Revue Hebdomadaire* of 21 May 1921; pp. 132-133: [octobre 1920]; pp. 134-137: [septembre 1920]; pp. 138-140: [fin juin-mi-juillet 1922]; pp. 141-144: [juin? 1922]; pp. 145-146: [vers avril 1920]; pp. 147-148: [vers la fin mai-début juin 1922]; pp. 149-150: [vers la mi-septembre 1922]; p. 151: [15 juillet 1922]; p. 152: [21 octobre 1922].³ (PHILIP KOLE, *University of Illinois*)

Cette âme ardente . . . Choix de lettres de André Suarès à Romain Rolland (1887-1891). Paris: Editions Albin Michel, 1954. Pp. 401. The title of this collection of letters, the fifth of the series of the "Cahiers Romain Rolland," is a fortunate choice. The soul and temperament of the ardent idealist penetrate all the pages with a frantic appeal to Art, to an ideal life of the spirit. If there is occasional evidence of instability and exaggeration, it must be attributed to the writer's youth—he was nineteen in 1887. Perhaps the most painful aspect—as Rolland remarked later—was Suarès' tendency to complain about his inability to express artistically the beauty he felt within him, the suffering that resulted, and his determination to live only in an ideal world, all too often a dream world that rendered reality painful and odious. Happily one feels the beneficial and appeasing influence of Rolland in some of the letters; Suarès admitted gratefully his friend's help (letter 15).

Suarès' letters testify to the depth of their friendship. But Suarès' love for Rolland was only part of his need to bestow and to receive affection. Letters 12, 13 and 20 are a striking expression, among others, of his love for his invalid father and for his sea-faring brother. The principal bond in this friendship was perhaps music, although their tastes sometimes differed (Rolland says that he changed some of Suarès' likes and dislikes).

The two friends were nevertheless different in character and temperament. Suarès occasionally emphasized their differences. Rolland, he said, was the more reserved; Suarès' nervous temperament made him weep at the sublime music of Wagner and at beautiful poetry. "Mais," he continued, "les émotions de la pensée, les rêves que forment au fond de mon être les souvenirs de *Parsifal* ou de la *Tempête*, je les entoure d'un culte pieux, et secret par là-même. Bien peu, je pense, savent à quoi s'en tenir sur mes réflexions, et un seul, je crois, connaît les voluptés douloureuses que j'y goûte. Au contraire, tu gardes tes impressions immédiates plus que les autres, et voilà pourquoi tu seras un artiste en acte, tandis que je ne

3. Another letter undoubtedly intended for Jaloux, although the addressee has not heretofore been identified, is published in Charles Briand's *Le Secret de Marcel Proust* (Paris: H. Lefebvre, 1950), 515-516. Proust's reasons for refraining from sending the letter to Jaloux are given in a later note in *Avec Marcel Proust*, p. 149. Proust had written it on returning home from the Bar du Bœuf sur le Toit, where he had dined, in the company of Jaloux, Paul Brach and Sylvain Bonmariage, on the evening of 15 July 1922.

le serai qu'en puissance" (letter of April 10, 1887). Art was his sole reality, and if he should be powerless to create in this realm, he would consider suicide in order to show "le néant de la non-vie," and the illusion of Life (letter 21). In a letter devoted to an unpublished drama by Rolland, *Orsino*, Suarès again formulated their differences "... La Vie est pour toi la raison de l'Art,—pour moi l'Art est la raison de la Vie; la Vie pour moi n'est que le moyen de l'Art,—pour toi l'Art n'est que le moyen de la Vie" (letter 76). His statement defines rather well the diverging paths followed by the two men.

Rolland respected and admired many of the traits of his friend's character, but criticized others (see Rolland: *Le Cloître de la rue d'Ulm*, 1952). Circumstances later separated the two, and when Rolland tried to renew their previous intimacy, he encountered various obstacles. In his unpublished "Journal" for 1911, he wrote: "C'est un homme plein de grandeur et de petitesse. [...] pour la vie de tous les jours, il est un homme d'un commerce inhumain. Les hommes ne sont pas ses frères. Les Hommes? Lui seul est l'Homme, 'Voici l'Homme!'"

The letters are at times confused and frequently of a style peculiar to Suarès. Nevertheless, when he consents simply to relate an incident, such as the boat ride (letter 19), they are lively, clear, and pleasing. Not all of his discussions of art, of writers, of artists and musicians are of great interest now. There are however remarks about music, about Wagner, Beethoven, and Schumann, about Tolstoy and Russian novelists, that elucidate both Suarès and his subject. His long letter on Balzac (letter 26; but see letter 55 where he partially reversed his first judgments) will be of interest to Balzacians.

The pendant to this volume, a choice of letters from Rolland to Suarès—not quite of the same years, for these letters have been lost, but from 1891 on—is scheduled to appear within the next year, and will be greeted by all those interested in the two writers. (WILLIAM T. STARR, *Northwestern University*)

Colette: A Provincial in Paris. By Margaret Crosland. New York: British Book Centre, Inc., 1954. Pp. 282. In 1895 after two years of marriage to Henry Gauthier-Villars, the legendary M. Willy, Colette revisited her native village of Saint-Sauveur en Puisaye in Burgundy. The outcome of this visit was the publication in 1900 of *Claudine à l'école* written in collaboration with her husband. Until her death this past August at the age of 81 Colette never ceased to draw on the memories and sensations of her provincial girlhood as the substance of her numerous novels, short stories, and essays. Impressions of her uneventfully happy youth color her accounts of the fatuous M. Willy, of her experiences as a mime in the music halls, of her loves and subsequent marriages, her family and friends, her career and ultimate fame. Consequently Colette has been frequently criticized for her lack of intellectual content although it is generally admitted that she possesses "style."

Miss Crosland traces Colette's life for us by quoting abundantly from her works. The quotations are skillfully chosen and happily occupy much of the biography; her admirable translations might well serve to introduce English-speaking readers to the artistry in Colette. Miss Crosland's attempts, however, to explain Colette's lack of popularity in England and the United States are often clumsy. Colette is presented as a French phenomenon apparently incomprehensible or, indeed, unacceptable to the prudish English: "In France the creative artist is considered a

natural, not an unnatural phenomenon. In England he is distrusted, in America he is a curiosity" (p. 268); or "In a country where serious attention is given to cricket, the nice things are so much more pleasant to talk about than what may have happened in the woodshed" (p. 266); or again: "The French regard much of British reticence as hypocrisy, they may or may not be right" (p. 230). The volume is filled with blunt, naïve generalizations.

In the same way the biographer sets out to strengthen the case for Colette by making a series of rash comparisons which are always in Colette's favor: "Madame de Sévigné is an example of how easily one can become a bore by talking about oneself. Colette, after fifty years of writing about Colette, is never a bore except to people who do not understand her" (p. 236). Miss Crosland pursues this approach by stating that such writers as Chateaubriand, Benjamin Constant, and Tolstoy are boring, or irritating, or self-pitying when writing about themselves, but that Colette has written about herself successfully because she has observed the three rules (Miss Crosland's three rules) of writing about oneself.

Miss Crosland also includes the usual piquant anecdotes ("the Scandal of the Moulin Rouge") and *grivoiserie* (M. Willy's blackmailing; Lesbianism, etc.) often associated with the name Colette. Fortunately Miss Crosland does not dwell on her stifling psychological interpretations of these incidents; she allows the reader to return to the more satisfying domain of Colette's own reports of her life. (ALVIN LABAT, *Columbia University*)

Opere. By Italo Svevo. Milano: dall'Oglio, 1954. Pp. 1076. This constitutes a most welcome addition to our library of Sveviana. The title *Opere* is somewhat misleading, for we find in this volume only the novels *Una Vita*, *Senilità*, *La Coscienza di Zeno*, and the short stories in the collection entitled *La Novella del buon vecchio e della bella fanciulla*. However, with the recent volume *Saggi e pagine sparse* (Mondadori, 1954), the promised publication of Svevo's dramatic works and a definitive edition of his correspondence (Mondadori and Zibaldone respectively), as well as the collection *Corto viaggio sentimentale*, we shall soon have the texts for studying the total work of the Triestine novelist.

The critical introduction by Bruno Maier (pp. 5-80) is to a large extent a reprint of his earlier essay, *Profilo della critica su Italo Svevo, 1898-1951*, reviewed in this journal, XLIV (1953), 67-69. It is unfortunate that the editor did not take the pains of bringing the topic up to date by integrating the recent important studies by Carlo Bo, *Riflessioni critiche* (Firenze: Sansoni, 1953), 443-464 and by Giacinto Spagnoletti. The last two mentioned critics correctly stress what seems to be one of the most important aspects and keys for an understanding of Svevo and the genesis of his work: his passion for the theatre. From his diary as well as from that of his brother Elio, we know that Svevo preferred to become a dramatist rather than a novelist and it is therefore essential to keep in mind the "theatrical" element throughout his work (see also *Italica*, XXVII [1950], 327-329).

Since the book we are reviewing was a commercial enterprise, the scholar's interests were of secondary importance. The ideal presentation of the text would have involved listing the textual changes between the two editions of *Senilità* of 1898 and 1927 respectively. These variants were the subject of a brilliant stylistic analysis by Giacomo Devoto in *Letteratura*, II (1938), 3-13 and also in his *Studi di stilistica* (Firenze: Le Monnier, 1950), 175-193.

Pages 1033-1077 present a most useful and impressive bibliographical appendix, listing editions and translations of Svevo's works. We do not find, however, a compilation of the translations of some of Svevo's short stories, which enjoy a certain popularity in this country through the excellent translations by Ben Johnson in *Accent*, *The Hudson Review*, and more recently in Marc Slonim's anthology (see also "Wiedersehen mit Angiolina," *Die Neue Rundschau*, LXIV [1953], 412-436). The approximately five-hundred critical studies, articles, and reviews are ample testimony to Svevo's importance and fame. (KARL LUDWIG SELIG, *The Johns Hopkins University*)

Mémoires improvisés. Par Paul Claudel. Recueillis par Jean Amrouche. Paris: Gallimard, 1954. Pp. 339. A une époque où l'autobiographie, encouragée par la critique littéraire qui fonde sur elle une partie de sa substance, s'est développée parfois avec excès; où dans des *Journal*, *Mémoires*, *Commencements d'une vie*, etc. Gide, Duhamel, Maurois, Mauriac livrent à leur public le secret de leurs pensées ou de leur conduite, Claudel s'était jusqu'ici refusé à ce genre de confidences. Sans doute pouvait-on y suppléer en quelque façon par cette passionnante correspondance, avec Alain-Fournier, Jacques Rivière, Gide, Jammes, Suarès, qui restera l'expression la plus révélatrice de la vie intérieure, spirituelle et intellectuelle de l'écrivain, et par quelques rares extraits, tel que *Ma conversion* publié par Charles Du Bos dans ses *Approximations*. Mais ces textes laissaient encore bien des lacunes. Il restait surtout d'établir une continuité chronologique entre les événements divers relatés ici et là. Ces *Mémoires improvisés* répondent superbement à ces besoins. Présentés d'abord dans quarante-deux émissions diffusés par la Chaîne Nationale en 1951 et 1952, filmés au moins en partie, ces entretiens avec Paul Claudel ont été publiés apparemment sans retouches. C'est ce qui fait à la fois leur intérêt et leur faiblesse. Faiblesse surtout en ce qui concerne la forme qui sent trop évidemment l'improvisation. D'où des négligences, des redites, certaines platitudes, quelques grossièretés, mais qui ne sont pas absentes non plus de l'œuvre du dramaturge et qui dépeignent assez bien, en somme, le Claudel Turelure. L'œuvre y gagne, par contre, une valeur unique de spontanéité, d'authenticité et de sincérité avec souvent un caractère primesautier qui n'est pas le moindre de ses charmes. Habilement provoquées par Jean Amrouche, qui s'est acquitté d'une tâche difficile avec une exemplaire sagesse, les confidences jaillissent, tantôt acquiescement, tantôt protestation contre une interprétation mal venue; ici rectification de détail, là précision nouvelle, ou même révélation sur un point peu connu. L'intérêt de cette présentation ne réside pas spécialement dans l'ordre biographique, bien qu'elle suive l'auteur dans une rigoureuse séquence depuis sa naissance jusqu'à ces dernières années. Mais Claudel reconstitue pour nous, avec une profusion de poussées centrifuges, ce qu'on pourrait appeler aussi "l'histoire de son esprit." On connaissait assez bien les quelques influences avouées ou proclamées par ce contempteur des lettres: Rimbaud, Eschyle, St. Thomas d'Aquin, Dante, Shakespeare. Il faudra maintenant réduire à des proportions bien plus modestes le rôle de Dante et même celui du dramaturge anglais dans la formation dramatique ou philosophique de Claudel. Mais on découvrira avec étonnement jusqu'à quel point il se réclame—comme Gide justement, et Amrouche n'a pas manqué de souligner l'ironie de ce rapprochement—de Dostoevski, "un de ces grands esprits formateurs dont j'ai reçu les leçons." Amrouche a tiré de l'auteur des renseignements de la plus haute importance sur

la genèse de ses œuvres, leurs racines profondes dans sa vie et dans sa pensée et l'interprétation qu'il convient de leur donner à la lumière de la théologie, de la Bible et des enseignements spirituels. Pourquoi devons-nous trouver dans ce livre encore de nouvelles preuves de l'étroitesse de vues de Claudel, d'une atrophie presque totale et point du tout nécessaire du sens critique par l'esprit théologique, par l'exclusion dont il frappe des auteurs comme Montaigne, Pascal, Flaubert, Proust, Bernanos le "raté," et, bien sûr, André Gide! (FERNAND VIAL, *Fordham University*)

L'Allemagne vue par les écrivains de la résistance française. Par Konrad F. Bieber. Genève: Librairie Droz, 1954. Pp. 181. The author has stated in his introduction that the goal of the present study is to "rechercher l'image de l'Allemagne, telle qu'elle apparaît dans la littérature française depuis 1939." That, however, implies a much broader aim than the title of the book would indicate. As it turns out, Mr. Bieber meant to limit his investigation to the works of "resistance" writers but to extend it beyond the years of the German occupation. There is no doubt that such a subject is worthy of the painstaking labor it would quite obviously entail. Unfortunately, prospective readers must be warned that they will be sorely disappointed if they look for a comprehensive treatment of French resistance writers or a thorough, methodical bibliography of their writings.

Mr. Bieber's bibliography is divided into two parts: "A) Documentation générale," an academic list comprising such items as "Pascal.—*Pensées*, Edit. Garnier"; and "B) Textes étudiés," numbering well over 350 items ranging, chronologically, from Barbusse's *Le Feu* (1917) to Gide's *Ainsi soit-il ou les jeux sont faits* (1952), and including such strange bedfellows as Julien Green, Friedrich Georg Juenger, and Pierre Drieu La Rochelle. Sometimes all the books of one author are included (Vercors), sometimes they are not (Camus, Triolet). We are never told on what basis the selection was made. Mr. Bieber seems to imply that he is concerned with important, representative works; at one point he writes that literary prizes give a fairly accurate indication of the public taste. (An interesting statement. Is Julien Gracq a popular author?) He then proceeds to examine a number of prize-winning novels (pp. 33 ff.). But why are not all such novels in the bibliography? What happened to the 1946 Goncourt (J.-J. Gautier), the 1944 Renaudot (Peyrefitte), the 1945 Renaudot (Bosco), the 1948 Femina (Robles), . . . ? The author does not even seem aware of their existence.

Another statement found in the introduction needs comment. "Ce sera un des objectifs de la présente étude de montrer que, dans l'ensemble, les écrivains français de 1939-45 se sont abstenus de cris de haine." That, the author has failed to do. First, because his study is not comprehensive enough (he purposely ignores most periodicals issued before the end of the war). Secondly, because even in the works of those writers he has singled out for study he must acknowledge expressions of hatred (see his treatment of Audisio, pp. 57-58). In the final analysis, Mr. Bieber's demonstration amounts to referring the reader to five authorities (note 28, p. 156). There is, of course, no question that Mr. Bieber (and his authorities) has a good point; but he overstates his case and does not accomplish what he promises to do. What has happened is that, interested in a limited number of writers, the author cannot see the forest for the trees. He prefers to generalize, and to develop theories (such as his claim that looseness of poetic form is compensated for by more rigorous

ethics [pp. 97-98]) rather than examine all the facts, in all their complexity. A study of the intellectual, social, and political background of French resistance writers; an objective consideration of the political climate of 1939 and the years following; a consideration of the change in the nature of war (national to ideological), a change not accepted by all Frenchmen; a more comprehensive examination of resistance literature—all this could have shed much-needed light on a very interesting question.

Mr. Bieber's work actually consists of mainly two essays: one on Camus (Chapter IV) and another on Vercors (Chapter V). The remainder is a rambling survey of resistance and pre-resistance literature, not all of it pertinent to the subject at hand. Thus, most of the discussion on French poetry in the first part of Chapter III is irrelevant. Since the author is obviously not at ease in the world of poetry, he would have been well-advised to leave alone such figures as Bremond, Mallarmé, and Valéry; even his remarks on Aragon are open to question.

As to style, one quotation will suffice: "Ayant végété en marge de la société et souvent dans un cercle fermé qui comportait le danger de snobisme, la poésie saute à pieds joints en plein centre de l'activité civique." (p. 74)

In short, Mr. Bieber has written a tribute to Camus, Vercors, Eluard, Guéhenno, and a few others, and displayed genuine sympathy for the struggle in which they were involved. French readers will be pleased, for he is on the side of the angels. But for the scholarly reader, this book falls far short of expectation. (LEON S. ROUDIEZ, *Pennsylvania State University*)

Cahiers de la Compagnie Madeleine Renaud-Jean-Louis Barrault, 1ère année, 1er cahier: "Paul Claudel et Christophe Colomb." Paris: Julliard, 1953. Pp. 127. Les *Cahiers de la Compagnie Madeleine Renaud-Jean-Louis Barrault* ont un double but: présenter d'une manière plus complète la pièce nouvellement créée par la Compagnie et resserrer les liens entre le public et les créateurs.

La présentation de l'œuvre comprendra "des textes de l'auteur, sur l'auteur, sur l'œuvre et sur tout sujet émanant de l'œuvre." Les liens avec le public seront rendus plus étroits par la publication de textes d'appui: "textes anciens . . . suggestions de nos contemporains" et, annonce Jean-Louis Barrault dans la "Présentation des Cahiers," par la création d'une sorte de Tribune Libre où seront réunis lettres, articles, propositions, critiques, auxquels la Compagnie ajoutera ses projets, ses mises au point et ses réponses.

En tête de la première partie, trois brefs articles (par Claudel, Barrault et A. M. Carré, O.P., respectivement), véritables méditations lyriques sur l'Enthousiasme et la Vocation de l'Autre Monde, sans rien apporter de bien nouveau même pour le grand public, sont agréables à lire. Ils mettent le lecteur en contact direct avec l'auteur et soulignent la signification profonde du drame.

Barrault signe deux autres articles dans cette partie principale des *Cahiers*. Le premier reprend ses idées sur le "théâtre total" (là encore, on retrouve des développements déjà connus par ses écrits antérieurs; et l'on regrette certaines formules qui tournent au poncif); il y discute également la mise en scène du *Livre de Christophe Colomb*, laquelle, d'ailleurs, suit de très près les indications de Claudel. Celui-ci, on s'en souvient, s'était déjà révélé prodigieusement doué pour le rôle de metteur en scène dans le *Soulier de satin*. A ce propos, nous regrettons avec d'autres critiques que la conférence prononcée par Claudel à Yale University en 1930 et

qui a servi de Préface à l'édition Gallimard du *Livre de Christophe Colomb* n'ait pas été incorporée dans les *Cahiers*. Texte capital dans lequel le poète s'explique sur sa conception du drame où l'accord est résolu entre la parole, la musique, le chœur, le décor et le cinéma.

Par contre, le second article, sorte d'historique des rapports Claudel-Barrault depuis leur première rencontre jusqu'à la réalisation du *Soulier de satin*, permet au lecteur, sous une forme anecdotique qui ne manque pas de charme, de glaner de précieuses indications sur l'auteur et le metteur en scène Paul Claudel et sur l'homme Claudel, "ce jeune homme aux cheveux blancs." La reproduction de quatre pages de remarques de Claudel sur la diction des acteurs n'est pas un des moindres attraits de cet article. Une fois de plus, on ne peut que s'émerveiller de la compétence phonétique du poète. Ses réflexions sur les consonnes sont tout un enseignement.

Un court article, que l'on voudrait plus long, de Darius Milhaud sur ses deux partitions pour *Christophe Colomb* rejoint la Préface de Claudel dont nous parlions tout à l'heure en insistant sur la distinction qui existe entre l'opéra "domaine du musicien" et le "commentaire lyrique total" auquel se prête l'œuvre de Claudel.

Les trois articles qui complètent cette première partie ont un caractère différent. André Frank traite, avec beaucoup d'humour, la question des "dates-hésitations" de la naissance de Christophe Colomb (plus de 18 dates différentes allant de 1430 à 1456, par plus de 80 spécialistes!) et les interprétations contradictoires de ce "Colomb aux cent visages..." Des documents iconographiques rassemblant les portraits les plus divers du Grand Découvreur enrichissent cette étude.

L' "Essai de chronologie de l'œuvre théâtrale de Paul Claudel" par André Alter renseigne en gros sur l'activité dramatique du poète. Malheureusement, la présentation de cette chronologie qui contient bien des lacunes est loin d'être systématique: c'est parfois la date de la composition de l'œuvre qui est indiquée, parfois celle de la première impression, ou encore celle de la première représentation.

Les quelque vingt pages de la remarquable leçon de Jacques Soustelle sur les dieux aztèques sont d'un intérêt passionnant; on admire à la fois l'érudition et la fougue du savant. Par ailleurs, on le trouve bien sévère vis à vis des libertés prises par Claudel à leur endroit: le poète a certes des devanciers célèbres au théâtre qui, bien avant lui, ont traité cavalièrement les "dieux morts" au profit du Dieu chrétien!

Une lettre de remerciements (lettre inédite de septembre 1913) de Jacques Copeau à Antoine, qui venait de parler en faveur du Théâtre du Vieux-Colombier, compose la seconde partie du premier *Cahier*.

La troisième et dernière partie s'ouvre par une lettre de Barrault qui réclame le rétablissement des vraies "générales." Suit une page de Renée Saurel sur le rôle qui lui incombe de découvrir des œuvres de valeur pour la Compagnie dans la masse des manuscrits dont elle assume la lecture. Le *Cahier* se termine par un exposé sur le "petit théâtre du Marigny" qui doit servir de laboratoire où la direction montera "des premières pièces" et travaillera "à certaines œuvres susceptibles de nous faire faire quelque progrès." On sait qu'en janvier dernier, fidèle à ses promesses, le petit théâtre a présenté la *Soirée des proverbes* de Schehadé et *Penthésilée* de Kleist, dans une traduction de Julien Gracq.

Nous ne doutons pas que ce nouveau périodique de théâtre dans la tradition de *Mask* de Gordon Craig, des *Cahiers du Vieux-Colombier*, d'*Entr'acte* de Jouvot, de

Correspondance de Dullin, etc. et n'ayant "ni la prétention ni l'intention" d'être comparé à une revue littéraire ne soit accueilli avec plaisir et profit par tous ceux qu'intéresse la chose théâtrale. (J.V.P.)

Langue et Culture de la France. By Ch. Vossler. Translated by Alphonse Juilland. Paris: Payot, 1953. Pp. 341. The publisher of this translation has taken several precautions in order to attract a wide reading public. There is no mention of the fact that Vossler's *Frankreichs Kultur und Sprache* dates back to 1929 and was an augmented revision of his *Frankreichs Kultur im Spiegel seiner Sprachentwicklung*, which appeared in 1913. Many notes and much of the bibliographical material have been omitted. Furthermore, I understand that Professor Juilland's criticisms of Vossler's theories or their application have been eliminated from the brief preface. The proofreading is poor. The Old French passages are particularly bad, and diacritical marks are consistently missing. It is disconcerting to find Du Bellay's *Défense* based on a work by Speroni Spermi (p. 205), and the Ordonnance of Villers-Cotterets dated (p. 305) as 1530 instead of 1539.

This is all regrettable, but we must be grateful that this landmark in the history of linguistic theory has finally been made accessible to French readers. The translation is rather free and very readable. For the first time, according to Professor Juilland, the French reader can become acquainted with a major work of the idealistic school. Vossler's school of linguistics, like that of the linguistic geographers and the modern functional-structural schools, was part of the reaction against the mechanistic and positivistic aspects of the neo-grammarians' historical approach. Vossler stressed language as expression rather than mere communication, as a creative activity reflecting the "spirit" of a people. His book, still stimulating today, is as much a history of French culture as it is of French phonology or syntax, for he tries to show a close parallel between the evolution of the language of France and its political and literary history. Professor Juilland makes the further point that the introduction of the "Geist" principle has helped to unify the science of language, and by providing causal explanations of linguistic change, make it truly scientific. (L.P.G.P.)

Le Théâtre de Giraudoux. Par Marianne Mercier-Campiche. Paris: Domat, 1954. Pp. 300. In undertaking a comprehensive analysis of Giraudoux's theater, Mlle Mercier must have felt that it was worth while going over the ground once again that has been pretty thoroughly explored and mapped out in recent years. Besides numerous lengthy articles, theses published and unpublished, two volumes in particular come to mind as having preceded the present work: Jacques Houlet, *Le Théâtre de Jean Giraudoux* (Pierre Ardent, 1945) and Hans Sørensen, *Le Théâtre de Jean Giraudoux* (Copenhagen: Publications of the University of Aarhus, 1950). The first work is short and limited to the plays produced during Giraudoux's lifetime. It disengages the essential themes of war, love, and the order of the universe, discusses Giraudoux's dramaturgy, and passes judgment on the plays. Sørensen's study is considerably more detailed and documented, a work of scholarship that would seem to do the job once and for all. Themes and techniques are taken up and some judgments are pronounced.

The aim of Mlle Mercier's work, as specifically stated in the *avant-propos*, is to present a *vue d'ensemble* of Giraudoux's theater. Accordingly we again review the

plays from the point of view of war, love, the order of the universe, etc. But this present work promises to do more:

Mais il s'agissait également de tenter une explication . . . La méthode adoptée dans le présent ouvrage: c'est celle de l'explication des textes par les textes eux-mêmes. Sans vouloir taire notre admiration pour l'œuvre de Giraudoux, nous avons cependant fait de notre mieux pour appliquer cette méthode objective, en excluant une seconde manière qui consiste à interpréter les textes en fonction des retentissements subjectifs qu'ils éveillent en nous. L'œuvre de Giraudoux nous paraît avoir été fort souvent appréciée à l'aide de la seconde méthode. En revanche, la première n'a guère été pratiquée.

Granting the many subjective approaches that have been made to Giraudoux's theater, the two above mentioned works, particularly Sørensen's, would seem to qualify as objective approaches, surely as much as this new one. As far as personal reactions are concerned, Mlle Mercier is no more silent about her disapproval than she is about her admiration. *Lucrèce*, for example, she dismisses as a great mistake. To this reviewer her technique does not appear basically different from her predecessors', nor does her labor seem rewarded with strikingly new insights into Giraudoux's theater.

In pointing out the previous coverage of the subject and protesting at what might be considered excessive claim to originality of method, an attempt has been made more to situate the present work than to condemn it as superfluous. Neither Houlet's work nor Sørensen's is easily available today; a new over-all study of Giraudoux's theater was properly deemed a legitimate undertaking. Only specialists could be expected to dig out the previous works, one ten years old and the other published abroad. Only specialists would be interested in Sørensen's close study of variants, etc. The current work puts into the hands of the general reader a book on Giraudoux's theater that, although not reading quite "like a novel" as its wrapper proclaims, moves along pleasantly, unencumbered by notes or references of any sort. Furthermore, when year after year new general appreciations of Proust, Gide, and other giants keep coming out, it seems unjust to declare the subject closed for Giraudoux. It is always interesting to learn how some one else views a favorite author. Whatever method Mlle Mercier thought she was following, it is her personal opinions that will be lingered over longest. How curious that she should think that of the characters in *Cantique des Cantiques* it is the President who represents true love! that the psychology of *La Folle de Chaillot* is more superficial than that of the previous plays! that Giraudoux must have been very ill when he wrote *Pour Lucrèce*, so bad does that play seem to her! Such observations are as stimulating as having a chat with a friend who has just read one of your favorite books. In a conversation it would be tempting to argue about little points and personal impressions. A reviewer, however, must resist such temptation. (LAURENT LESAGE, Pennsylvania State University)

GEORGE R. HAVENS'

THE AGE OF IDEAS

*from reaction
to revolution*

*in eighteenth-century
France*

This book is about the development, expression, and shattering impact of ideas of liberty and justice upon a society tyrannized by the state and dominated by a royal dictator—the fascinating story of eighteenth-century France. The author writes of the vivid personalities who fathered these ideas—Pierre Bayle, Fontenelle, Fénelon, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and Beaumarchais—showing us their background, the forces that influenced them and their ideas, and how they reflected and influenced the age.

A work of enlightened scholarship—easy in style, factually accurate, and fascinating to read.

educational edition, \$4.50

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY • 383 MADISON AVE., N. Y. 17

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE LANGUAGE SCHOOLS

Summer
1955



July 1 to August 18

FRENCH

GERMAN

ITALIAN

RUSSIAN

SPANISH

Scientific training in the spoken language

Professional refreshment and inspiration

Superlative instruction in literature and
civilization

Flexible graduate programs

Seven weeks in the lovely Green Mountains

For complete information write:

The LANGUAGE SCHOOLS Office

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE

Middlebury 30, Vermont
